



# The MODERN LANGUAGE FORUM

Organ of the Modern Language Association  
of Southern California

■ ■ ■

## CONTENTS

FRIEDRICH VON SPEE AND MARION OPITZ.....	Gustave O. Arlt	65
THE FRENCH REVOLUTION AND RELIGION.....	Léon R. Yankwich	76
SER AND ESTAR IN BEGINNING CLASSES....	Walter V. Kaulfers	87
THE RESEARCH COUNCIL, 1932-1936.....	F. H. Reinsch	92

### POLITICAL REVIEWS:

FRANCE .....	Paul Périgord	96
GERMANY .....	Gerald M. Spring	99
SPAIN .....	H. Corbató	101

### REVIEWS

Charles Baudelaire, <i>Flowers of Evil</i> (H. R. Brush).—Norman Lewis, <i>Spanish Adventure</i> (Joaquín Ortega).....	103
Text Books, reviewed by Marius I. Biencourt, Lucy M. Gidney, Stella Lovering, Godfrey Ehrlich, F. H. Reinsch, H. Corbató.....	106
Modern Language Association of Southern California: Supplementary List of Members.....	112

**Officers and Executive Council  
of the  
Modern Language Association of Southern California**

■ ■ ■

MARY E. DAVIS.....Pasadena Junior College

*President*

DOROTHY M. JOHNS.....University High School, West Los Angeles

*Vice-President*

ISABELLE L. D. GRANT.....San Pedro Senior High School

MEYER KRAKOWSKI.....Los Angeles Junior College

ESPERANZA CARRILLO ..... Hollywood High School

VIRGINIA DASSO.....Francis Polytechnic High School, Los Angeles

*Secretary*

SAMUEL L. BLACKER.....Belmont Senior High School, Los Angeles

*Treasurer*

DOROTHY GILSON.....Glendale High School, Glendale

*Chairman, French Section*

EMIL TOEWS.....Santa Monica Junior College

*Chairman, German Section*

VIRGINIA DASSO.....Francis Polytechnic High School, Los Angeles

*Chairman, Spanish Section*

**RESEARCH COUNCIL**

F. H. REINSCH.....University of California at Los Angeles

*Chairman*

CESAR BARJA, *Editor*

University of California at Los Angeles

MARION A. ZEITLIN, *Assistant Editor*

University of California at Los Angeles

JOHN PADILLA, *Business Manager*

Beverly Hills High School

■ ■ ■

*The Modern Language Forum* is published quarterly in February, May, September, and December. All manuscripts, books for review and publications should be addressed to the Editor, 10721 Wellworth Avenue, Los Angeles, California. All correspondence relating to advertisements, and all advertising copy should be addressed to John Padilla, Beverly Hills High School, Beverly Hills, California.

Membership in the Modern Language Association of Southern California is \$2.00 yearly (from October 1st to October 1st) and carries with it the subscription to the *Modern Language Forum*. The subscription price for non-members is \$1.50 per year; single numbers, 40 cents, postage prepaid. Checks for memberships or subscriptions are to be made payable to "The Modern Language Association of Southern California" and should be sent to Miss Dorothy M. Johns, Secretary of the Membership Committee, 148 South Elm Drive, Apt. 3, Beverly Hills, California.

# MODERN LANGUAGE FORUM

Formerly MODERN LANGUAGE BULLETIN, Established 1915

VOLUME XXI

MAY, 1936

NUMBER 2

## FRIEDRICH VON SPEE AND MARTIN OPITZ

### A CONTRAST IN THE MECHANICS OF LYRIC TECHNIQUE

It must be admitted that many of the larger aspects of German literary relations in the Seventeenth Century are still veiled in considerable obscurity. Concerning this period we hold a good many beliefs—or perhaps they are only impressions—that have come down to us from an earlier generation of scholars, that were perhaps first expressed by Lachmann, or Hettner, or Scherer, and that have been faithfully repeated or paraphrased year after year by later writers until their very heritage endowed them with the dignity of dogma. These axioms by courtesy—or merely by inertia—we perpetuate and disseminate with slight misgivings but rarely with a healthy doubt.

Among many other things our beliefs concerning Martin Opitz are influenced by inherited notions. Revered, almost adored, by his contemporaries, we are told, he became the object of general emulation. "Scarcely any German writer," says Koberstein<sup>1</sup>, "wielded within his lifetime the degree of literary authority as Opitz. Even the century following his death stands completely under the influence of this man." Writers and critics from Fleming to Gottsched praise him in extravagant terms and even Bodmer finds it in his heart to publish a collection of poems in praise of the Silesian bard.

With the gradual waning of popular regard for Martin Opitz, the poet entered the second phase of his literary existence, for presently it fell within the province of the literary historian to test his right to immortality. And now we are confronted with a complete reversal of attitude toward the erstwhile "Father of German Poetry." He is suddenly regarded as a talented mediocrity, a gifted opportunist, a glib imitator of Classic and French models who possesses neither originality nor even good taste. Wilhelm Scherer<sup>2</sup> most succinctly expresses the almost unanimous judgment of his century in these words: "Never has an inferior poet with so little justification attained a prominent position in literary history as Martin Opitz."

In spite of the evident divergence of opinions, one point apparently

<sup>1</sup>August Koberstein, *Geschichte der deutschen Nationalliteratur*, 5th ed., 1872, Vol. II, pp. 41-49.

<sup>2</sup>Wilhelm Scherer, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*, 3rd ed., 1921, p. 247.

emerges from the conflict: Opitz was undoubtedly an influence upon his own period, and perhaps upon the entire century following. Whether this influence was for better or for worse, whether the precepts of Opitz advanced or retarded the development of German literature does not fall within the province of this discussion. Whether his *Buch von der Teutschen Poëterey*<sup>3</sup> is his own original product, or whether it is a compendium of the wisdom of Scaliger, Pierre Ronsard, and Daniel Heinsius, is of little importance. The fact remains, that a large number of writers of the Seventeenth Century appear to have formulated their verse on the basis of Opitz's postulates. This influence is so pronounced and apparently so widespread that most literary historians, down to the present day, group the majority of writers of the first half of the Seventeenth Century in the so-called First Silesian School. It is unnecessary to quote an array of authority for this assertion: may it suffice that even the latest edition of Kluge, *Geschichte der deutschen National-Literatur*<sup>4</sup> lists under the heading "Die Dichter, welche sich an Opitz anschlossen," such names as Fleming, Logau, Albert, Spee, and Scheffler.

Compared with Martin Opitz, Friedrich von Spee has been assigned a somewhat obscure niche in the literature of the Seventeenth Century. It is true that his *Trutznachtigall*<sup>5</sup> enjoyed a modest popularity for half a century after the poet's death. It is equally true, however, that this collection of lyric poems was not even printed during the author's lifetime, and that it circulated only in a small number of manuscript copies until the year 1649. It is practically certain that no contemporary poet was even aware of Spee's existence: his sphere of influence, if one may use this term at all, was certainly limited to a small number of clerics in the Rhineland district. An attempt to present Friedrich von Spee as a rival to Opitz among his contemporaries would be obviously absurd. On the other hand, a comparison of the lasting popularity of these two poets down to the present time would certainly result in favor of Spee. The Romanticists, beginning with Wessenberg<sup>6</sup>, interested themselves in a revival of this poet, attracted, no doubt, by his mysticism. Even after the decline of Romanticism, however, Spee continued to enjoy a degree of popularity which was never vouchsafed his better known contemporary. It is significant that the nineteenth

<sup>3</sup>Breslau, 1624; ed. W. Braune (*Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke des XVI. und XVII. Jahrhunderts*, No. 1), Halle, 1913.

<sup>4</sup>Hermann Kluge, *Geschichte der deutschen National-Literatur*, 56th ed., 1931, p. 84.

<sup>5</sup>Köln, 1649; ed. Gustave O. Arlt, *Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke des XVI. und XVII. Jahrhunderts*, No. 292-301, Halle, 1936.

<sup>6</sup>Ignaz von Wessenberg, *Friedrich Spees Auserlesene Gedichte*, Zürich, 1802.



century produced twenty-one separate editions of Spee's *Trutznachtigall*<sup>7</sup> against only three of the works of Opitz.

The purpose of this discussion is to advance some hitherto unconsidered evidence in favor of the complete independence of Spee from the influence of Opitz. Aside from the obvious fallacy of including in the First Silesian School a poet who never was more than fifty miles east of the Rhine, and who, according to internal evidence, was probably not familiar with the writing of Opitz, it can be shown that Spee's views on the art of poetry differ materially from those of Opitz. A demonstration of this fact is particularly simple in the case of Spee because he prefaced his collection of lyric poems by a concise statement of the principles which he followed in his writing. Beyond that, a brief analysis of his poems will show his independence in such matters as are not touched upon in his preface.

The method which I propose to follow is the simple pointing out of contrasts between the tenets of Opitz expressed in his *Buch von der Teutschen Poëterey* and either the stated precepts in the introduction to Spee's poems or the practical application within the poems themselves. Emphasis will, of course, be placed upon differences rather than similarities; in fact, obvious points of agreement between Opitz and Spee will not be mentioned at all. The general classification of material will deal first with the language, second with poetic structure, and third with rhyme. I wish to point out once more that the question of Opitz' sources does not particularly concern us and that likewise Spee's relation to Classic or French models is of small importance.

The sixth chapter of the *Buch von der Teutschen Poëterey*<sup>8</sup> is entitled "Von der Zubereitung und Zier der Worte," and deals with fairly general linguistic principles. In the following words Opitz expresses his demand that dialect words are not to be used in the construction of poetry: "Die Zierlichkeit erfordert, dasz die Worte rein und deutlich seien. Damit wir aber reine reden mögen, sollen wir uns befeissen dem, welches wir hochdeutsch nennen, besten Vermögens nach zu kommen, und nicht der Örter Sprache, wo falsch geredet wird, in unsere Schriften vermischen." An analysis of Opitz' own application of this dogma shows that he carefully attempts to follow it out but with varying success. For the most part he actually avoids the use of dialect forms in grammar, but he does not always succeed in avoiding individual words which are indigenous to his East

<sup>7</sup>Cf. Gustave O. Arlt, "Friedrich von Spee's *Trutznachtigall*: The Editions and a Bibliography," *Modern Philology*, Vol. XXXIII, No 2, Nov. 1935, pp. 159-168.

<sup>8</sup>M. Opitz, *Buch von der Teutschen Poëterey*, ed. W. Braune, p. 27.

German locality. It may be assumed, however, that such dialect words are used in good faith, and that he believes them to have the sanction of general German usage.

Spee, on the other hand, has a somewhat broader vision with regard to dialect words. In the fourth section of his preface<sup>9</sup> he frankly admits his inability to confine himself to a strictly literary vocabulary: "Und zwar die Teutschen Wörter betreffend, soll sich der Leser sicher drauf verlassen, dasz Keines passirt worden, so sich nicht bei guten Autoren finden lasse oder bei guten Teutschen gebräuchlich sei, ob schon alle und jede Wörter nicht bei *einer* Stadt oder Land zu finden sein; sondern ist das Privilegium oder Vollmacht *Dialecte* zu gebrauchen in Acht genommen."

So much for localisms of vocabulary; furthermore, if Spee has any intention of avoiding dialectic forms in grammar, which he does not specifically mention, this intention is not at all apparent. He does not hesitate to use the very expressions which Opitz lists as opprobrious, such as "han" for "haben," "sach" for "sah," "sicht" for "sieht," "nit" for "nicht," "gan" and "lan" for "gehen" and "lassen." These few illustrations<sup>10</sup> may suffice, but it would be possible to compile a long list of dialecticisms of grammar.

Opitz, in keeping with his intention of purifying the German language, is violently opposed to the indiscriminate use of foreign words, a characteristic of many of his contemporaries. In the third section of the sixth chapter<sup>11</sup> he expresses himself as follows: "So steht es auch zum heftigsten unsauber, wenn allerlei lateinische, französische, spanische und welsche Wörter in den Text unserer Rede geflickt werden." He follows this statement with several examples from the works of contemporaries in which he ridicules such words as "Devotion," "Chevalier," "Madonna," "Favor," and others. Spee does not touch upon this point in his preface and it is necessary to consult his poems in order to ascertain his usage in this regard. Here it becomes apparent that he has equally good intentions with regard to purity of language as Opitz, and he certainly does not indulge in indiscriminate use of foreign words. It is also apparent, however, that his meticulousness does not verge upon pedantry and that he does not hesitate to use foreign words and expressions which have general currency in the

<sup>9</sup>Friedrich von Spee, *Trutznachtigall*, ed. G. Arlt, p. 6\*.

<sup>10</sup>In order to eliminate a mass of footnotes, no page references are given to the examples from *Trutznachtigall*. All illustrations are chosen at random and the reader will have no difficulty in finding large numbers of similar occurrences in the text of the poems.

<sup>11</sup>Opitz, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

language of his period. The following list includes the more obvious among the foreign words which he occasionally uses: "tractiren," "bancketiren," "muntiren," "braviren," "falliren," "coloriren," "concupiren," and the nouns "Discurs," "Carmesin," and "Concipient." It strikes the eye that the majority of these words are verb formations upon foreign stems; the meanings of all are self-evident, and some of them have acquired good usage in the German language. Nevertheless it must be conceded that they *are* foreign words, and as such fall under the ban of Opitz' dictum. Moreover they belong to a category which Opitz most specifically regards as objectionable for he says: "Wir sollen auch besonders nicht versuchen die fremden Wörter zu verdeutschen, indem dasz wir deutsche Endungen daran hängen." It is perfectly clear in this regard the views of Opitz and Spee are diametrically opposed to each other.

One of the important sections of the sixth chapter of the *Buch von der Teutschen Pöeterey* deals with the question of sentence structure. Opitz is of the opinion that proper prose sentence structure must be observed even in poetry, and that the exigencies of the meter should not cause changes in word order which might be awkward or even improper in prose. He specifically requires, for example, that an attributive adjective should precede its noun and he does not acknowledge the possibility of a construction which would excuse a reverse order. To quote once more from his book<sup>12</sup>: "Auch sonst haben die Epitheta bei uns ein gar übel Aussehen, wenn sie hinter ihr Substantivum gesetzt werden, als, 'das Mündlein rot,' 'die Hände fein,' für 'das rote Mündlein,' 'die feinen Hände,' wie wohl bei unseren Reim-machern nichts gemeiner ist."

Again Spee is much less dogmatic than his contemporary: in fact it is quite apparent that he has no compunctions about reversing the order of adjective and noun if it suits either his meter, his rhyme, or the emphasis of his sentence. This applies both to a simple adjective and noun construction as well as one in which the adjective has one or more modifiers of its own. For example: "Drum Jüngling frisch und lebend, euch hebet aus dem Grab," "Manche Linden kahl und bloß," "O Schäflein unbeschoren," "Ihr Nachtigallen kleine," also the following: "Das Blümlein jung von Tagen," "Das Fräulein reich von Stimmen." Hundreds of instances similar to the above are found in his poems. They are so frequent that it becomes evident that the poet had no feeling of impropriety in such order.

Ordinary inverted word order is, according to Opitz, one of the

<sup>12</sup>Opitz, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

particularly reprehensible constructions. "Die Anastrophe oder Verkehrung der Worte," he says<sup>13</sup>, "stehet bei uns sehr garstig, als 'den Sieg die Venus krieget,' für 'die Venus krieget den Sieg'." He continues with the accusation that inverted word order is always an indication of the writer's inability to construct proper verse.

A few quotations from *Trutznachtigall* will serve to illustrate the types of inversion which Spee most frequently uses: "Den Takt gebt mit den Flügelein," "Den Leib man leiblich niessen thut," "Grün färbet er den Erdenklosz." Sentences headed either by the object or predicate adjective are extremely numerous; other parts of the predicate are less frequently found at the beginning of the line. The question of word order in Spee's poems is one of great interest. In the course of the evolution of his poems he changes the word order again and again, generally for the purpose of synchronizing metric and structural emphasis. In his endeavours to place sentence and word stress together he frequently permits a construction to become quite unusual: in his corrected manuscripts he then recasts this construction until it again approximates good German usage. This process he explains in the preface where he calls the reader's attention to the principles of rhythmic speech. In very simple words he demonstrates that certain syllables in the German language must be stressed and that these syllables must therefore occupy the stressed positions in the rhythm. His application of this principle makes it apparent that he subordinates prose structure to the interest of poetic structure and that his only guiding desire is to retain an understandable sentence. In the Straszburg manuscript of *Trutznachtigall* in which the character of the poet's corrections leaves the older text visible, we find seventy-three instances of changes in word order. The Trier manuscript, which represents a further elaboration, contains sixty-one alterations in sentence structure, while the print of 1649 again changes fifty-six additional sentences. This large number of emendations of constructions proves that Spee was much concerned with the question of synchronizing metric and speech stress, that he did not, however, subordinate the meter to the exigencies of prose word order, and that, therefore, he does not at all adhere to Opitz' rules in this regard.

One of the great concerns of Opitz is the matter of the elision of the unstressed "e." In this regard it appears he is strongly influenced by French usage as expressed by the poet Ronsard. In fact it is not at all apparent that his rules have a direct application to the German language. Opitz demands, for example, that a final "e" preceding

<sup>13</sup>Opitz, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

an initial vowel in the following word *must* be omitted. To quote once more from the *Buch von der Teutschen Poëterey*<sup>14</sup>: "Das 'e,' wenn es vor einem anderen selbstlautenden Buchstaben zu Ende des Wortes vorhergeheth, wird nicht geschrieben und ausgesprochen, sondern an seine Statt ein Apostroph dafür gesetzt." This demand is undoubtedly based upon French application in connection with Alexandrine verse, in which the final "e" before a vowel is always disregarded in counting the syllables. German usage has never fallen in with this rule, either in Opitz' time or later, chiefly because Alexandrine verse has never gained general favor among German writers. Opitz likewise insists upon the corollary to the foregoing rule, namely that a final "e" followed by an initial consonant must never be omitted. He states: "Ich kann nicht recht sagen: 'die Wäll der starken Stadt'; oder 'nehmt an mein schlechte Reime'." Again the basis for this rule is unquestionably French usage.

Spee evidently is either unfamiliar with this French custom or considers it inapplicable to German verse. He makes no mention of it in his preface and evidence must again be gathered from his poems. We find only a few examples of the presence of final "e" before an initial vowel, for instance, "Solches Blümlein, solche Art," "So ungestüm nichts finde : Das nicht einst höre auf," as over against much more numerous cases of omission of final "e" in this position. It appears, however, that even a small number of such cases would suffice to demonstrate that Spee has no serious compunctions in this respect. Examples of the reverse type, namely omission of final "e" before a consonant, are extremely numerous: "Lieb vom Himmel ihn vertriebe," "Die letzten Wort vom Ende," "Sie hält für ihr Gespielin." Instances of this character appear on the average of one per page throughout the entire book; numerically they are as frequent as the cases where "e" is not omitted before a consonant. The implication of these figures requires no further elaboration: it is evident that Spee refuses to be guided either by Opitz or by French models.

The omission of an unaccented "e" within a word is another subject of criticism by Opitz against German poets. "Welchem die Reime nicht besser als so von statten gehen," he says<sup>15</sup>, "mag es kühnlich bleiben lassen." In this connection he then cites several examples of objectionable usage, objectionable from any point of view. It is not clear whether such common omissions as of "e" in the word "genug" would also come under the ban, or whether Opitz refers only to more

<sup>14</sup>Opitz, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

<sup>15</sup>Opitz, *op. cit.*, p. 38.



unusual instances. Spee never omits an unaccented "e" which is essential to the pronunciation of the word. Apparently he does not consider the "e" in the word "genug" essential because he omits it with great regularity. The second "e" in the word "Feuer" is frequently omitted, but this word had not yet consistently developed a second syllable. Occasionally the second "e" in the word "welches" is left out, and there are three instances of "G-w-a-l-t" for the word "Gewalt." If any conclusions can be drawn from this meagre amount of evidence it would be that Spee definitely feels the impropriety of omitting essential unaccented letters, but that he has no compunction about the omission of letters that do not seriously affect the pronunciation of the word.

The general conclusions which we may now very briefly draw regarding the phonology, vocabulary, and grammatical usage of Spee appear to be these: that he is not pedantic; that he acknowledges the admissibility of dialect words and forms; that he is willing at times to sacrifice prose construction to metric exigencies; that he is not influenced by French models; and, finally, that he allows himself far greater latitude of expression than an application of the rules in *Teutsche Poëterey* would ever permit.

Turning now to the more specific matters of versification, we find that Opitz devotes a lengthy chapter to their consideration. He begins with a careful definition of rhyme and continues by pointing out types of rhymes which he considers improper. His first point of criticism concerns improper coupling of closed with open "e"; he refers to the former as Greek epsilon, the latter as eta. Some of the examples which he cites are of rhymes which would sound improper even in contemporary language, such as "kehren" and "hören," "ehren" and "nähren." He also includes rhymes which do not in the least offend the modern ear, for example, "lehren" and "scheren," "entgegen" and "pflegen." The old closed "e" in these words had become open long before the time of Opitz and it seems to be an unnecessary bit of pedantry to distinguish it from the original open "e."

Spee had already pointed out in his preface that he intends to make use of dialect words. This privilege he extends also to the use of dialect rhymes. He not only rhymes the older closed "e" with open "e," but also treats the younger closed "e", the Umlaut "ä", in a similar manner. He rhymes, for example, "fehlet," and "wählet," "mehr," and "wär," "leer" and "Bär." He goes so far as to unround the Umlaut "ö" for rhyme purposes, "stät," and "öd," "wählen" and "höhlen," "steht" and "blöd." Such rhymes, according to Opitz, are entirely unpermissible, but we find them in abundance a century later



even in the best writers: Goethe and Schiller do not hesitate to use them. Even Spee's diphthong "eu" is constantly subject to unrounding: "freud" and "leid," "neunzig" and "einzig," "säumen" and "reimen" occur again and again. The justification for such rhymes is, of course, to be found in Spee's Rhenish dialect, just as Schiller's Swabian and Goethe's Hessian speech later furnished such rhymes for them.

In passing, it is interesting to note that in the rhyme "hören" with "kehren," Opitz<sup>16</sup> condemns not the unrounding of the Umlaut "o" but merely the coupling of an open with a closed "e" sound; the former, he says, is an open "e", the latter, closed. Is it possible that even the meticulous Opitz is influenced by his local dialect?

"Und letztlich," continues Opitz<sup>17</sup>, "wird der Reim auch falsch, wenn in dem einen Verse das letzte Wort einen doppelten Konsonanten hat, das andere einen einfachen." He then cites such rhymes as "rasen" and "maszen," "verwahren" and "harren," etc. Such rhymes, incidentally, had already met with the disapproval of the Meistersinger in the preceding century. Adam Puschmann, as well as the Kolmar and Steyer Tabulatur, refer to these rhymes as "lind-harte Milbe" and list such examples as "Knabe-Knappe," "Tod-Gott." Spee's poems are replete with rhymes of this character: "Sonn" and "Kron," "Ross" and "los," "strafen" and "waffen," "beten" and "metten." The examples show that he does not confine this practice to any particular consonant, but that he impartially uses all consonants in this manner. It should also be pointed out that these rhymes are not always justified by the Rhenish dialect, although in some instances they appear to be. It must be admitted that in this respect Spee is far from a purist and that many of these rhymes are undoubtedly improper by any modern standard. Again, it clearly appears that if Spee was familiar with Opitz' book he refuses to follow its precepts.

An investigation of Spee's meters is hardly rewarding. He confines himself to trochaic and iambic feet, arranged in the simplest stanzaic forms. His lines are either trimeters or tetrameters: he never at any time uses a line of as much as five feet. His tetrameters show a strongly marked caesura, so strongly marked indeed that his printer occasionally breaks the lines into two dimeters. It is remarkable that Spee does not credit his reader with any familiarity with trochaic feet: he not only devotes considerable space in his preface<sup>18</sup> to an explanation of

<sup>16</sup>Opitz, *op. cit.* p. 36.

<sup>17</sup>Opitz, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

<sup>18</sup>Spee, *op. cit.*, p. 6\*.

this meter, but also calls attention to it again in a head-note at the beginning of every poem of this character. One wonders, in reading these notes, whether the trochaic meter was not somewhat new and strange to the poet himself.

Opitz is, of course, far more sophisticated than Spee with regard to meters. He has made a careful study of Latin and Greek writers as well as of his French contemporaries. He speaks glibly of Alexandrine verse, of Ronsard's "Vers Communs," of sonnets, quatrains, Sapphic and Pindaric stanzas, and illustrates each form with original examples. It is impossible to overlook the fact that he is not only very partial to Alexandrine verse, but that he considers this type as best suited to the German language. He agrees with Ronsard that the shorter ten-syllable line is better adapted to the French language, but argues that German and Dutch can well make use of the thirteen-syllable line because these languages are less direct and less compact than the French.

Strangely enough, Opitz is entirely misinformed both as to the character and the origin of Alexandrine verse. "Unter den Iambischen Versen," he says<sup>10</sup>, "sind züförderst die zue setzen, welche man Alexandrinische, von ihrem ersten Erfinder, der ein Italiener soll gewesen sein, zue nennen püflet." This type of verse is, of course, not Italian but French in origin and its name is not derived from that of the first person to use it but from the name of the Song of Alexander, a French epic of the Twelfth Century. Moreover the French Alexandrine line is not Iambic; if it were it would scarcely have become the favorite meter of French poets. On the contrary, it is well adapted to French poetry because it has a suspended stress and permits the accentuation of the final syllables of a speech-group. It is characteristic of the weakness of German poets of the Seventeenth and early Eighteenth Centuries that this error on the part of Opitz gave the Alexandrine verse a preëminent position until finally Lessing laughed it out of existence. I have no intention, however, of weighing the evidence either for or against the use of this meter in German poetry, but merely to reiterate the well-known fact that it was Opitz who introduced it. As far as Spee is concerned, not a single line of Alexandrine verse from his pen has been preserved: not even the Straszburg Manuscript, which is full of collectanea and paralipomena, contains a single attempt at such a line.

As we look over the poetic practices of Spee alongside of the maxims of Opitz there hardly seems to be a point of contact between them. It is practically impossible, therefore, to summarize in a paragraph and to

<sup>10</sup>Opitz, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

demonstrate where and how Spee diverges from his contemporary. The two poets appear to have followed utterly different lines of development and there certainly is no evidence of any character to show that one was dependent upon the other. In regard to the linguistic aspects of his work there might perhaps be room for the belief that Spee was familiar with the *Buch von der Teutschen Poëterey* but that he simply refused to accept it and altered many of its rules to suit his own purposes. In regard to the meter and rhyme, however, there is not the slightest room for such belief, and on the basis of the evidence presented here I am quite convinced that Spee was entirely unfamiliar with Opitz' famous book.

It is safe to say that Spee's continued popularity in the Nineteenth Century and even in the Twentieth is largely due to his independence of the artificial rules that Opitz devised. It is not necessary to point out that poetic practice since the Classical Period has developed along much freer lines than those prescribed by Opitz. Not only does the poet demand far greater latitude in the use of language than Opitz permits him, but he also enjoys greater freedom in the construction of verse than is possible in the strict Alexandrine line. I have already called attention to Schiller's and Goethe's frequent use of dialect rhymes and even words. The development in the New High German language since their time has sanctioned most of the rhymes which, in the Eighteenth Century, were still dialectic. When such rhymes are used today, they represent good usage and standard literary German.

It is not my intention, of course, to set up Spee as a conscious forerunner of poetic usage of a much later period, nor is it my intention to minimize the efforts of Opitz in the direction of the establishment of a standardized poetic language. As a matter of fact, I do not wish to draw any invidious comparisons, or to elevate one poet at the expense of the other. It appears entirely probable that Spee, consciously or unconsciously, discovered certain poetic principles which a much later period was to adopt. From this fact emerges the question whether literary historians have possibly overlooked the true status of Spee, not so much in his own period, as in the general pattern of literary history. Finally the conclusion seems warranted that we must regard Spee as one of those rare persons who stands outside of his own period and outside of the sphere of contemporary influence and builds for himself a poetic structure of his own, grounded on wide reading and on impeccable literary taste.

GUSTAVE O. ARLT

*University of California at Los Angeles*

## THE FRENCH REVOLUTION AND RELIGION

### I

#### THE FRENCH REVOLUTION IN PERSPECTIVE

"C'est la faute à Rousseau; c'est la faute à Voltaire." So runs a popular poem. Even historians have tried to blame the French Revolution upon philosophers. But catastrophic phenomena of this type cannot be so explained. Philosophers and philosophic thinkers may give shape to the aspirations of a group which makes a revolution, or leads in it. They cannot supply the causes which go deeper, and which furnish the social or economic background out of which an upheaval like the French Revolution arose. In the last analysis, it was a revolt against feudalism, led by the bourgeoisie and the urban population, intent upon establishing a political order which would take into consideration the rights of the newly risen merchant class.<sup>1</sup> With that in the background as the fundamental cause, the immediate causes, whether we call them excessive taxation, inequality, the excesses of the feudal system, lose their importance. The Revolution lasted from 1789 to 1799, when Napoleon ended the Directory, through his *coup d'état* of the 18 Brumaire (November 9, 1799). While it is spoken of as a single event, it is really a series of events, expressing a social and political ideal. It was the work of a whole century of changes and transformations.

To a great extent it has remained an ideal. But writers as unlike as André Siegfried<sup>2</sup> and Peter Kropotkin<sup>3</sup> have stressed the value of the French Revolution, not only in endeavoring to achieve the liberation of the individual from ancient shackles, but also in inspiring everywhere else the same spirit. However, these ideals do not appear at a definite time. The Revolution, in all its stages, was the attempt to make social and political organization correspond to realities. As Mathiez says, "It came out of the disparity, deeper every day, between realities and the laws, between institutions and customs, between the letter and the spirit".<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>See A. Mathiez, *La Révolution française*, vol. I, pp. 1-2; Frantz Funck-Brentano, *L'Ancien Régime*, pp. 556-561; Louis Madelin, *La Révolution*, pp. 12-15; A. Aulard, *Histoire politique de la Révolution française* pp. 1-28; *La Révolution française et le régime féodal*; H. Taine, *L'Ancien Régime*; Pierre Gaxotte, *La Révolution française*; *The French Revolution*, *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. VIII; Daniel Mornet, *Les origines intellectuelles de la Révolution française*.

<sup>2</sup>André Siegfried, *The American Age*, in *The Drift of Civilization*, p. 256.

<sup>3</sup>Pierre Kropotkin, *La grande Révolution*, p. 746.

<sup>4</sup>*La Révolution française*, vol. I, p. 1.

But neither the bourgeoisie,—which furnished the ideology of the Revolution,—nor the workmen and peasants,—the democratic elements which gave it impetus and later assumed leadership,—had very definite republican or democratic ideas, when it began. There was no republican party in France in 1789. And while there was a rationalistic spirit in France, there was no anti-clerical, anti-Catholic or anti-Christian mass movement. Just as later events developed the republican and democratic spirit, so did they also develop, by degrees, the anti-clerical, anti-Catholic and anti-Christian spirit.

## II

### THE CHURCH IN 1789 AND BEFORE

France attained religious unity in the fifth century. And, despite the difficulties over Protestantism, in the sixteenth century, it retained it to the end of the eighteenth century. France,—although she bore the name of eldest daughter of the Church (*filles aînée de l'église*), and although her kings bore the names of *rois très chrétiens* (most Christian Kings),—retained a good deal of religious independence. As Champion has said, "Eldest daughter, but not slave, of the Church, France retained towards her old mother a respectful but dignified attitude, a tone full of independence"<sup>5</sup>.

It may be true, as some conservative historians<sup>6</sup> claim, that for twelve centuries the Church labored almost single-handed in the building of the French nation. But the French kings have always exercised independence towards the Church, and conveniently quarreled with the Papacy, temporarily always, in order to secure special privileges within the Church, such as the right to nominate bishops, through the pragmatic sanction. This was the essence of the Gallicanism of the French church. The policy was followed by some of her greatest kings, Charles VII, Louis XI, Louis XII, Francis I, Henry IV, Louis XIV, as also by Napoleon.<sup>7</sup> Louis XIV expressed it in saying that he sought, "*Baiser les pieds au Pape . . . et lui lier les mains*" (To kiss the Pope's feet, but to tie his hands)<sup>8</sup>.

But if this policy helped France in her relations with the Papacy, it did not stand in the way of the Catholic clergy's attaining what some have called the most unique position in the social structure of any nation,—that of its most important privileged class.

<sup>5</sup>Edme Champion, *La séparation de l'église de l'état en 1794*, p. 8.

<sup>6</sup>Pierre Gaxotte, *La Révolution française*, pp. 7-9.

<sup>7</sup>Louis Madelin, *France et Rome*, pp. 1-112, 297-299.

<sup>8</sup>Madelin, *Ibid.*, p. 8. On the deep historical roots of French opposition to Roman power, see Julien Benda, *Histoire des français*, pp. 137-158.

Immediately before the Revolution, the Church appeared to have the strong position it had held since the Middle Ages. Catholicism was the only religion recognized by law. It was the only worship allowed publicly. Its clergy were the only authorized spiritual teachers. And the greater number of those employed in the education of youth were members of the clergy or nuns. Politically, the Church enjoyed valuable privileges. It was the only body possessing the right to even partial self-government.

This self-government, while limited by the Crown's prerogative, was nevertheless real. The governing body was the national assembly of the Church of France which met every five years. Each of the sixteen provincial assemblies was represented by two bishops and two of the inferior clergy. In order to preserve the prerogatives of the Crown, the clerical assembly was prohibited from promulgating any decree without the king's previous knowledge and approval. No new religious order could be established without his sanction, nor could lands be acquired or alienated without his consent. The right of nominating bishops and archbishops, subject only to papal confirmation, and the disposal of many inferior preferments were part of the patronage reserved to the Crown under the rights of the Gallican church. Through his control of these appointments, the king was able to control the clergy and, at the same time, to bind the nobility (from whose ranks the high offices of the Church were filled) to the Crown.

Emile Faguet has insisted that the desire for equality more than the desire for liberty was the cause of the French Revolution. This inequality expressed itself in the privileges of the clergy. The entire cost of the government was borne by the masses. Neither the clergy nor the nobility paid any taxes. On the contrary, a special levy, *dîme*, was made for the support of the clergy.

While the wealth of the Church has been exaggerated, conservative investigations place it on the eve of the Revolution at nearly three billion *livres* (the exact figure is 2,992,538,140.00 *livres*) or an annual income of 80 million *livres*. This, according to some authorities, was easily doubled by the voluntary contributions, which had been entrusted to the Church, for religious purposes,—such as prayers for the dead, or aid to the living. Great dissatisfaction arose from the fact that these contributions were considered not as held in trust, but as the outright property of the Church, and there was much complaint about the manner in which the duties which were attached to these gifts were performed. It was stated by the Duke de Larochevoucauld in the Assembly of Nobles in 1788 that because of these offerings which the Church



defended as gifts of piety, there were 400,000 lawsuits pending, which charged non-fulfillment of the obligations attached to them.

The inequality expressed itself in the administration of the Church. Few of the sons of the people were ever entrusted with high Church offices. These were practically all held by the nobility. Every one of the 143 bishops (in 1789) was a member of the nobility. The high clergy was not distinguished for its piety. On the contrary, a good deal of worldliness existed among them. And while some of the high clergy had yearly incomes ranging from 100,000 to 400,000 *livres*, some of the lower clergy, particularly the rural clergy, were receiving less than a living wage: the average for a *curé* being 700 *livres* a year, for a vicar 300. It is not insignificant that recent studies have disclosed a large number of the lower clergy among the original subscribers to the *Encyclopédie*. The lower clergy was in favor of the constitutional aspirations of the Third Estate. They were the ones who, as Madelin says, made the Third Estate triumph<sup>9</sup>.

The size of the religious establishment is also significant. There were between 120,000 and 140,000 ecclesiastics, of which 20,000 to 30,000 were members of religious orders, 60,000 to 70,000 were secular priests, and about 37,000 members of women's religious communities.

This clergy, with their power, their control of the civil status (births, marriages and deaths) and of learning, owning a good share of the domain of France, exempt from taxation,—except such gifts as they voluntarily gave to the king,—occupied a preeminent position among the three classes of the state.

There was no great religious fervor in the French people. The people had approved (in 1767) the expulsion of the Jesuits by the Parliament of Paris. They showed their joy by embracing one another upon the streets of Paris. A spirit of tolerance, fostered by the free-thinkers of the eighteenth century, and so popular among the *élite* permeated even the smaller communities. The philosophers did not create this spirit, which often manifested itself in impiety. On the contrary, incredulity caused the philosophers to be more daring than they might have been, had they lacked approval<sup>10</sup>.

There was general (outward) observance of the Catholic religion, among the peasantry. But writers from Taine to Aulard have insisted that there always is and has been a good fund of paganism in the French peasant, and that the French could not be called a pious people, in the sense in which the Spanish are a pious people. The intolerance of

<sup>9</sup>Louis Madelin, *La Révolution française*, p. 18.

<sup>10</sup>See A. Aulard, *Le Christianisme et la Révolution française*, pp. 22-23.

the clergy was great. But the people were tolerant. And because of the feeling for the humble members of the clergy and their sympathy with the constitutional aspirations of the Third Estate, no one would have thought (in 1789) of dechristianizing France. Not even the philosophers. Voltaire himself, while attacking the Church as *l'infâme*, meant not the church (or religion) as such, but the church entrenched within the state, controlling, intolerant, tyrannical and making an offense against its dogma, an offense against the state. He himself did not advocate disestablishment, but rather tolerance for other creeds and subordination of religion to the state. He considered religion good for children and the common people. He built a church at his estate in Ferney with this inscription: *Deo erexit Voltaire*. Other leaders of the Revolution, Montesquieu, D'Alembert, Abbé Raynal, and others saw the need for religion within the state. The various *cahiers*, containing the grievances of the Third Estate before the convocation of the States-General, sought greater tolerance, and removal of abuses. So one is justified in concluding that everyone was intent on retaining Catholicism, that it remain indestructibly tied to the destinies of the kingdom, and that it be protected from attacks.

### III

#### THE CIVIL CONSTITUTION OF THE CLERGY

It will be remembered that one of the grievances out of which the events which led to the French Revolution arose, was that there had been no convocation of the States-General for one hundred and sixty year—not since 1614. Louis XVI was forced to convoke the States-General to meet on May 1, 1789. Because the grievances of the *cahiers* formulated by the provincial assemblies were in confusion, and the King had no definite policy, and the privileged classes were not ready to concede equality,—being merely willing to grant some relief in matters of taxation,—the members of the Third Estate proclaimed themselves the representatives of the nation. On June 20, 1789, they took oath never to separate until a constitution of the kingdom had been enacted. They thus became the Constituent Assembly. They established the Constitution of 1789, retained the monarchy, and declared the rights of man. They gave the legislative power to a single legislative chamber of 745, selected by an electorate, according to property qualifications. This assembly was followed by the Legislative Assembly, which lasted from October 1, 1791 to September 20, 1792.

How did the Church fare under these bodies?

The first attacks were against the property of the Church. The

tithes (*dîmes*) were abolished, on August 4, 1789. There was no opposition to this measure upon the part of the clergy. To achieve this, no special statute was passed. The change was made as a part of the law abolishing feudal rights. It was not to go into effect, however, until provision had been made for the support of established religion by the state. The action was not dominated by any anti-clerical feeling.

The Assembly, not only continued Catholicism as the established religion, but it also placed the constitutional revolution under its benediction, by ordering that a special medal be cast and that a *Te Deum* be sung in all the churches and parishes of the kingdom. When the declaration of the rights of man and the citizen was promulgated (August 4, 1789), it contained only a mild declaration of tolerance, in these words: "No one shall be interfered with on account of his opinions, even religious, provided that their manifestation does not disturb the public order established by law."

There was no great protest against this attitude upon the part of the clergy. The real conflict began later, when, on November 2, 1789, in order to deal with the precarious financial condition of the country, a decree was enacted which placed Church property at the disposal of the government, in order to meet its obligations. The government, at the same time, assumed the obligation to maintain the religious establishment, and to take charge of its charities to the poor. It was a bishop who first suggested this,—Talleyrand,—at the session of October 10, 1789. Mirabeau was impressed with the idea. There was strong opposition to it. It passed only by a vote of 368 to 346. This decree still recognized the property of the Church. It merely permitted the sale of some of it, to meet national emergencies. On December 19, 1789, properties of the Church to the amount of 400 million *livres* were ordered sold. These decrees changed entirely the attitude of the clergy. Historians consider them as the beginning of the war between the Church and the State. However, the Church was still hopeful. So long as its right to its property was recognized, all was not lost, although some of the clergy were beginning to lose their interest in the Revolution. There were voices being heard that the clergy had been duped by the Revolution. The final blow was struck by the decree of April 10, 1790, which nationalized the properties of the Church. But even then, the lower clergy, while disappointed in the Revolution, did not come out openly against it.

What caused an entire change of attitude was the civil constitution of the clergy, enacted on July 12, 1790. This made the clergy civil servants, elected by the electors, and receiving a salary from the state.

For the support of the Church a budget of 10 million *livres* was provided. Monastic vows were abolished, and the priests were compelled to take an oath of allegiance to the Constitution. The Pope was deprived of the right of investiture. However, while a bishop did not need the confirmation of the Pope, he was compelled to address him, after election, thereby recognizing him as the head of the Church, and confirming Church unity.

This constitution struck a blow at the Church, to which it could not submit. The Catholic Church might have accepted disestablishment. It might even have accepted, or, at least, conformed to complete separation. It could not, even in the face of the many rights of the Gallican church, accept an administrative change in the constitution of the clergy, imposed by a state, and over which it had no authority. Louis XVI withheld his approval. He wrote directly to Pius VI. The Pope answered, on August 18, that he would study the constitution. Louis' ministers were counselling against a veto. The Pope delayed. Finally, on October 22, the Pope wrote that the decree could not be accepted. In the meantime, the contents of the decree had been published throughout France. Everywhere, the popular societies were agitating in favor of the execution of the decree. The King finally signed the law on December 26, 1790. Many of the clergy had been elected, in the meantime, and some, soon after the decree was signed, actually took the oath. Talleyrand took it on December 28. The session of January 4, 1791, was set aside for the general taking of the oath by the clergy who had not taken it before. Many took it. However, a majority did not. Only four bishops took it: Talleyrand, Jarente, Savine and Lemonie. The bishops who refused to take the oath were removed and new constitutional bishops were elected in the spring of 1791. Talleyrand was consecrated as head of the new church on February 20, 1791, by the three others who had taken the oath. On March 10 and April 13, 1791, the Pope issued two briefs condemning as schismatic, the civil constitution. The papal nuncio left Paris on May 31, 1791. Later, the Pope refused to receive Louis XVI's new ambassador to Rome, M. de Ségur. Because he is of the view that the civil constitution brought the King's appeal to foreign powers, and the consequent war and regicide, Madelin traces to it all the events which led to the Napoleonic dictatorship. He says that it struck at Catholic sentiment and enslaved the King's Christian conscience. Mathiez and Champion are of the view, however, that a majority of the members of the Constituent Assembly were devout Catholics, had no intention of hurting the Church, but sought merely to make it conform to new institutions, and that they expected the Pope to accept the change.

Aulard shows that the sympathies of the people were with the clergy who had conformed and taken the oath (*sermentés*), and that their open opposition to those who had not taken it (*insermentés*), indicated a desire to go beyond mere nationalization.<sup>11</sup> Stricter measures were taken, later, against the clergymen who refused to take the oath. The King was dethroned on August 10, 1792. On August 18, 1792, all secular congregations were abolished, and on August 27, 1792, the registration of births, marriages and deaths was taken away from the Church and given to municipal authorities. Despite these measures and the subsequent measures against the refractory priests, taken by the Constitutional Convention,—which convened on September 20, 1792, and which abolished royalty on the following day,—there was no intention of abandoning the civil constitution. Despite popular agitation towards more radical measures, none was taken. The Constitution of 1793 recognized freedom of conscience. Aulard is of the view that had not the counter-revolutionary insurrection, known as the *Vendée*, taken place,—in which the aristocracy had the support of the refractory clergy and the Pope,—there would never have been any dechristianization. He says, "Without the Vendée, there would have been no cult of Reason".<sup>12</sup>

#### IV

##### SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

We need not enter into a detailed review of the events which led to the Law of Separation of September 18, 1794. The intransigency of the papacy, the aid of the higher clergy to the counter-revolution, made the step inevitable. It was achieved by a series of decrees which abolished the Church budget, and restored the Church property to the faithful. Prior to it, non-governmental dechristianization had gone on. In Paris, there began to develop the cult of Reason. Many of the churches which had been vacant, because the priests had refused to take the oath or had emigrated, were thrown open to the worshipers of this cult. The aim was to substitute what might be called a natural christianity, deistic in its scope. While leaders of the revolution took part in it, the government stood aside. Under it, there developed patriotism as a cult.

There also developed the cult known as *theophilanthropy*. It also was a deistic cult, inspired by the ideas of Voltaire and the English free-thinkers. It denied revelation, and mystic dogmas. It recognized no formalism. The members met in private or public places, in order to encourage one another in the practice of morality. They had eighteen

<sup>11</sup>*Le Christianisme*, pp. 69-84.

<sup>12</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 89.



churches or chapels in Paris. These they adorned with simple moral inscriptions, flowers or fruits. They sang hymns, and honored the great, Socrates, Saint Vincent de Paul, Rousseau, George Washington. While tolerated by some officials, it had no governmental sanction. Masonry, of course, was quite influential in the clubs. Equalitarian in its doctrines, it had helped organize and direct the ideas which were later expressed in the Constitutional Assembly.<sup>13</sup>

On May 7, 1794, the cult of the Supreme Being was established officially, by the Convention. The chief tenets of this cult were: The existence of a Supreme Being, and the immortality of the soul. The practice of social duties, among which the most important are: to hate bad faith and tyranny, to punish traitors and tyrants, to aid the unfortunate, respect the weak, defend the oppressed, to do others all the good one can, and not to act unjustly towards anyone.

After establishing four national holidays (in commemoration of July 14, 1789, August 10, 1792, January 21, 1793 and May 31, 1793), thirty-six holidays were established dedicated to the finest human virtues and the best gifts of nature. The list was headed by the Feast of the Supreme Being. This was considered by the democratic elements a substitute for Catholicism. It resulted, in reality,—just as the cult of Reason had,—in a cult of patriotism. It thus gave the popular element,—which was now in charge of the Revolution,—a religion. While this transformation was going on, the civil constitution of the clergy was left untouched. In the meantime, events had moved fast. The Constituent Assembly having fallen on August 10, 1792, the Constitutional Convention was called. Its object was the revision of the Constitution, to take into consideration the abolition of royalty. It began its work on September 22, 1792. There developed in this convention the fight between the Girondists and the Mountaineers. The Mountaineers won and the Constitution of 1793 (enacted on June 24) was democratic and expressed their ideas. After the Thermidorian reaction it will form the battle cry of all popular uprisings. So when a crowd invaded the Convention on April 1, 1795, their cry was *bread and the Constitution of 1793*.

In July, 1793, the Reign of Terror began. It continued until the death of Robespierre on July 27, 1794. The rise of the cost of living and the economic crisis, aided by inflation, had led to it.<sup>14</sup> With the fall of Robespierre, the democratic republic fell. And it fell, in the

<sup>13</sup>See Gaston Martin, *La Franc-Maçonnerie française et la préparation de la Révolution*.

<sup>14</sup>A. Mathiez, *La vie chère et le mouvement social sous la Terreur*.



opinion of many, because Robespierre had not had time to develop democratic institutions. As Mathiez says, "You cannot wipe out twenty centuries of monarchy and slavery. The most rigorous laws cannot change, with one stroke, human nature and the social order."<sup>15</sup>

On July 27, 1794, (the 9th Thermidor) began the Thermidorian reaction. Through the Directory (October 27, 1795 to November 19, 1799) it led to the consulship of Napoleon and to the monarchical restoration. The separation of church and state, and the reopening of the churches followed the Thermidorian reaction. The step was inevitable. Although the foreign menace had been repelled, the reunion of church and state became impossible because of the counter-revolutionary activities of the clergy. The Law of Separation guaranteed complete liberty and equality to all religious denominations. The preamble recited, among other things: No one can be prevented from professing and exercising any religion he chooses. The law must guarantee such exercise against interference. Ministers of cults must obey the laws of the state. To that end, an oath of civic obedience must be exacted. These ideas the law embodied. The churches were returned to the faithful. The separation was of great benefit to the Church. The clergy took charge of the churches. There was no interference by the civil authorities. The church was as independent of the state, as the state was of the church. It would not seem that anything else was desired from the standpoint of either church or state. Yet Napoleon, through the Concordat of July 15, 1801, restored Catholicism as a state religion. He did it as a political measure, believing that religion was necessary for the safety of the state. He also had in mind the Church's aid in securing the throne later. He called religion "a sort of vaccine which protects us against sorcerers and charlatans, by satisfying our love for the marvellous." He considered religion the only means of maintaining inequality, in a society which cannot exist without inequality. Public opinion in France did not demand the Concordat. Cardinal Consalvi in his letter to the Pope, dated July 2, 1801, wrote:

The opposition against the reunion with Rome is incredible. All officialdom, the philosophers, the libertarians, and the army are against it. They have charged the first Consul to his face that he is seeking to destroy the Republic and bring back the monarchy. He is terribly upset by it: *He is really the only one who desires this reunion*<sup>16</sup>.

No wonder the Pope thought the Concordat the result of a miracle. That the realistic cardinal saw well into the motives of Napoleon, history has amply demonstrated.

<sup>15</sup>A. Mathiez, *La Révolution française*, vol. III, p. 223. See A. Mathiez, *Girondins et Montagnards*, pp. 1-19, 83-139.

<sup>16</sup>Quoted by A. Aulard, *Histoire politique*, p. 734.

The Concordat ended the strife between the church and state. Napoleon proceeded under it to exterminate liberal and free thought. It took over a hundred years to undo Napoleon's work. This was done by the Law of Separation of December 9, 1905, which unchained religious strife in France,—a strife that would have been unnecessary had not Napoleon undone the work of the Convention of 1794.<sup>17</sup>

In the early eighteenth century the great French preacher Massillon stated the problem of the Church: "L'église n'a pas besoin de grands noms, mais de grandes vertues" (The Church needs not great names, but great virtues).<sup>18</sup> The Church in France possessed great names. Had it possessed great virtues, the history of its relation to the French Revolution might have been different.

LEON R. YANKWICH

*Judge of the U. S. District Court, Los Angeles*

---

<sup>17</sup>See René de Chauvigny, *La résistance au Concordat de 1801*; L. G. Wickham-Legg, *The Concordats, Cambridge Modern History*, vol. IX, pp. 180-208.

<sup>18</sup>Quoted in Madelin, *La Révolution*, p. 17.

## SER AND ESTAR IN BEGINNING CLASSES

It is perhaps unnecessary to indicate that to the average high school freshman such terms as "predicate noun," "essential or inherent quality," "proper adjective," etc., when employed to define the uses of *ser* and *estar* in Spanish, are as foreign as the verbs themselves, wherefore to explain a foreign usage in terms of a second lingo equally unfamiliar to the learner would seem not only time-consuming, but downright bad psychology. Whatever is gained from explanations phrased in this idiom is usually comprehensible to the adolescent only in terms of the examples offered—which suggests that the rules themselves could often be omitted with a possible economy of time and effort to all concerned.

The degree to which the treatment of *ser* and *estar* recommended below will seem acceptable will depend largely upon the extent to which the following propositions regarding the use of grammatical rules with adolescents are considered valid. In dealing with subject-matter involving grammatical distinctions, such as those which govern the uses of *ser* and *estar*, it is assumed:

1. That in the light of present knowledge in the field of educational psychology, rules have no *raison d'être* except as short-cuts to insights, and then only to the extent to which understandings would be difficult or uneconomical of time and effort in attainment through purely inductive exploratory activities.

2. That rules should, so far as possible, partake of the nature of informal explanations rather than of abstract sententia—their function being to simplify the learning process, not to complicate it with extraneous technicalities foreign to the experience of the novice.

3. That the transfer from rule to practice—not to mention comprehension of the rule itself—is facilitated to the extent to which explanations are phrased in words within the learner's own vocabulary.

4. That the introduction of rules or explanations for special usages should be reserved until after the novice has had occasion to contact the material (at least on the recognition level as vocabulary, through reading or informal third-person question-and-answer activity), and until he has obtained some appreciation of its place and function in the general scheme of things.

5. That if rules are not to become mere academic jargon, conducive only to abstract philosophizing *about* language, they should preferably be introduced, fixed, and reviewed only as explanations for concrete usages; and that the examples in such cases should precede the rule in order of presentation. (That the examples themselves should be composed of words of high frequency, and expressive of some item of thought or information worth communicating is taken for granted<sup>1</sup>.)

6. That explanations are likely to possess greater pedagogical value when solicited by the students themselves in response to curiosity or felt need: Information imparted at such times is destined to be attended with greater interest and attention than information offered perfunctorily on less auspicious occasions.

---

<sup>1</sup>Walter Kaulfers, "Contextual Settings as Auxiliaries to Recall," in *The Modern Language Forum*, Vol. XII, No. 4, pp. 5-8 (October, 1927); "Type Forms as Media of Instruction in Spanish," in *The Modern Language Forum*, Vol. XIII, No. 3, pp. 7-10 (June, 1928).

7. That when explanations involve a distinction only between two factors, it is preferable, in accordance with the principle of single emphasis, to state the facts concerning only *one* of the factors, preferably the least comprehensive of the two, leaving the novice temporarily free to employ the other "in all the remaining cases."<sup>2</sup> A double series of rules for closely related items of language complicates the learning process, leading not infrequently to befuddlement and confusion. In the case of *ser* and *estar* this principle is among the most frequently violated of all precepts of method.

In accordance with the foregoing propositions the special study of the differences between *ser* and *estar* is deferred until the students have had opportunity to meet the verbs in reading, in third-person question-and-answer (where they function merely as vocabulary), or in *précis* writing using illustrative content. When an adequate background in experience has been established through activities of this kind to enable the novice to recognize the verbs in context, and, in the case of classes stressing oral work, to answer simple third-person questions involving their use, the detailed study of points of usage can be undertaken with some assurance that the principle of motivation has been capitalized.

Since the uses of *ser* and *estar* involve a distinction between only two factors, it will be desirable to prevent confusion by concentrating attention at first only on the verb permitting of the simplest explanation, and to leave the learner free to use the second verb in *all other cases* (See proposition 7 above). For the differences in point, the following non-grammatical explanations have proved adequate to all essential purposes in high school and college beginning classes:

SER and ESTAR both mean to be: am, is, are, was, were, be, been. Forms of *estar* are used (1) in speaking or asking about the *location* of any person or thing; and (2) in speaking or asking about any condition that *can change backwards or forwards daily*. In all other cases forms of *ser* are used.

Lest the foregoing explanation appear inadequate, the following analysis is offered:

(1) *Dónde está Ud?*

Asking about location; therefore *estar*.

(2) *La puerta está abierta.*

In general, doors *can* be opened and closed from day to day. Therefore the condition is *changeable backwards or forwards daily*, in accordance with explanation 2. (See also discussion of passive voice following illustration 9.)

(3) *El café está frío.*

In general, coffee *can be* reheated; therefore this condition falls within the province of explanation 2.

(4) *Soy español.*

The statement makes no mention of location, nor of a condition that is changeable within the limits of explanation 2; therefore, a form of *ser* is used.

(5) *Es usted del Perú?*

The question does not ask *where* you are—you are right in the classroom now

<sup>2</sup>This problem has been treated more fully by Leavitt O. Wright, "Things to Omit from an Elementary Spanish Grammar," in *Hispania*, Vol. XVI, No. 1, pp. 59-65 (February-March, 1933). See also Emile B. de Sauzé and William L. Connor, "Notes on Some Phases of Foreign Language Instruction in Cleveland," in *Education*, Vol. LV, No. 1, pp. 1-5 (September, 1934), especially p. 4.

—nor does the question ask about anything changeable in the sense indicated in explanation 2; consequently a form of *ser* is used. Note that the same type of reasoning can be applied to such uses as *El reloj es de oro*, *Es una casa blanca*, etc.

(6) *Es tarde*.

A form of *ser* is used since nothing is said about location, and since the condition is not changeable *backwards* within a day. If it is late at a given moment, it can only become later, never earlier. Observe that similar explanations hold for *El es rico*, *Es muy joven*, and the like.

(7) *No está usted cansado?*

A form of *estar* is used because the condition can vary within a day and from day to day, in accordance with explanation 2. Similar explanations hold for *Cómo está usted?* *Estoy un poco indisposto*, *Juan estaba enfermo*, etc.

The foregoing applications cover most of the usages with which elementary classes will be confronted. That the explanations hold even for more subtle cases, however, can be judged from the following:

(8) *Ella está obediente*.

*Ella es obediente*.

In the first case, the condition is spoken of in the sense of conduct or deportment, variable from day to day, or within a day. In the second case, it is conceived as relating to general *character* over a period of time, which is obviously a less variable condition.

(9) *El clima es bochornoso*.

A form of *ser* is used since there is no reference to location, and since climate is not a condition changeable within a day, nor from day to day. If variable atmospheric conditions are meant, the *weather*, not climate, is involved. Exceptional uses of this kind, however, should probably be reserved for treatment in connection with the idiomatic uses of *hacer*: *Hace buen tiempo?*, *Hacía frío*, etc.

Although the analysis does not adequately cover such cases as *La montaña estaba cubierta de nieve*, *El museo está cerrado* (see example 2 above)<sup>3</sup>, the conviction is strong that these specialized uses may well be deferred until the study of the *passive voice*. The use of *estar* instead of *ser* to indicate conditions as distinct from *actions* (compare the uses of *sein* and *werden* in German) can then readily be drawn without risk of confusion. There is certainly no reason why the whole story must be told at one time. Good teaching merely requires that the material be presented at the most opportune time as judged from the viewpoint of the *learner*. If a precocious student should inquire regarding the reason for this seemingly irregular usage, it should suffice to offer as a temporary explanation an answer such as the following:

"We shall see later that *estar* is often used instead of *ser* when we wish to speak of a fact as a *condition* rather than as an *action*. In the sentence *La montaña está cubierta de nieve* the speaker means that the mountain is 'snow-covered.' *La montaña es cubierta de nieve* would mean that the mountain 'is being covered' with snow. You will not

<sup>3</sup>G. Cirot, "Ser et Estar avec un participe passé," in *Mélanges de Philologie*, (1904) pp. 57-69.

need to bother about this use for the time being, but if interested, you can find it explained in detail on page ..... of the text."

Although none is more aware than the writer of the seeming childishness of the foregoing analysis, the discussion is presented without apology on this score. Indeed, it would seem paradoxical to maintain that the teaching process should be other than "childish" when the learners themselves are *children*. Perhaps it is because instruction in foreign languages has often been too far above the level of childhood that effective outcomes have been so difficult to attain. Whatever the weakness of the treatment, the conviction is strong that the explanation is as conducive to good usage as any of the more technical rules, while claiming in addition the following merits:

1. It states the problem in ordinary English, comprehensible to the novice, without recourse to a single grammatical term.
2. It abbreviates the treatment to two non-technical explanations on the principle of single emphasis, avoiding the confusion likely to result when sets of parallel rules are given for each verb.
3. It enables the novice to think directly in terms of *meanings*, rather than indirectly in terms of "predicate adjectives," "inherent attributes," "intrinsic characteristics," and the like.
4. It sufficiently delimits the field of usage to avoid the difficulties arising from such vague generalizations as "In general *estar* indicates a temporary condition, whereas *ser* indicates an inherently permanent fact or condition." Such vagaries scarcely offer satisfying explanations for *Es tarde*, *Era rico*, *Son las dos*, and the like.
5. It permits of a rationalized interpretation of many specialized uses which otherwise require separate treatment: e. g.,

(10) *Ella está cantando.*

This usage is adequately covered by explanation 2. Thus the *psychological* reason, rather than the grammatical reason, for the use of *estar* in the progressive tenses can easily be understood on the basis of analogic radiation.

(11) *La escena es en España.*

That such comparatively rare uses should be introduced in beginning classes is almost inconceivable—a few things should be left for the university. Nevertheless, it should be observed that the example can be interpreted as satisfactorily in terms of the explanations suggested as in terms of the abstruse grammatical jargon conventionally employed. "The scene is in Spain," to the Spaniard apparently does not imply *location* in the strict sense, since in reality the scene may be located on the stage of a theater in New York, Chicago or Paris. Consequently, since explanations 1 and 2 do not hold, a form of *ser* is used.

The chief difficulties besetting the approach are fortunately easy to overcome provided due precautions are taken. These arise from the almost universal tendency of students, through habits of careless reading, to overlook the full implications of Explanation 2. Insofar as these are merely difficulties in the comprehension of *English*, however, they can be avoided by a judicious choice of pertinent examples at the start. That merely knowing why one verb rather than another should be employed does not insure accuracy in subsequent use hardly requires



mention\*. The assumption is merely that an approach which simplifies the development of insights in such a way as to make the facts of usage more meaningful to the learner (thereby saving time for actual practice in the language itself) is to be preferred to an approach which by its unpsychological character and grammatical faddism befuddles rather than clarifies issues, and unnecessarily diverts attention from language as a means of communication to language as a mechanism.

Formal Grammar is the epitaph of language.

WALTER V. KAULFERS

*Stanford University*

---

\*The problem of fixation has been treated at length in the writer's discussion of "The Mastery-Unit Plan in Foreign Language Teaching," in *Hispania*, Vol. XIII, No. 5, pp. 417-430 (November, 1930).

## THE RESEARCH COUNCIL, 1932-36

The Research Council of the Modern Language Association of Southern California completed its work for this year by distributing the final sections of its mimeographed report on minimum essentials in vocabulary. Copies of the complete report may still be obtained from Mr. William H. Fletcher at the Los Angeles Junior College.

The Research Council desires to express its appreciation to all the teachers who helped in the work of collecting information, comparing course requirements in various schools, and setting up standards for the several modern languages in the first two years of high school and the first year of college.

A brief survey of the activities of the Research Council may serve to call attention to the need for further cooperation among foreign language teachers. On February 20, 1932, the Executive Committee of the Association, with Mr. Meyer Krakowski of the Los Angeles Junior College as President, selected fourteen representative teachers of the various foreign languages from the several types of schools or colleges in Southern California and designated this group as a permanent Research Council to direct and coordinate pedagogical and linguistic research projects and to publish results obtained.

The Research Council met for the first time in the Modern Language room of the Los Angeles Junior College on March 12, 1932, together with the Executive Committee of the Association. Dr. William H. Snyder, Principal of the Los Angeles Junior College, was present and spoke briefly in appreciation of the contribution which language study may make to general culture. Under the direction of Mr. Krakowski the Research Council completed its organization with Mr. Frank H. Reinsch as Chairman, and Mr. William H. Fletcher as Secretary.

The first formal activity of the Research Council was the direction of a series of round table discussions at the spring meeting of the Association, April 30, 1932. As a result of these discussions the Research Council was able to organize several subcommittees based on the professional interests of its members. These groups in turn brought their findings to the meetings of the Council. The year 1932-33 was spent in a general survey of the status of foreign language instruction in the secondary schools.

During the year 1933-1934 the Research Council sponsored a series of discussion meetings on the theme of integration, and at the spring meeting in 1934 recommended the adoption of the statement of objectives published in the September, 1934, issue of the *Forum*. After

more than one hundred members of the Association had taken an active part in the conferences arranged by the Research Council, it was agreed that modern language teachers must revise their aims and technique. The specific values which have always been associated with modern language instruction now appeal to a diminishing minority of our students. In the light of recent developments in secondary education, certain general values of foreign language study must receive more adequate recognition. This does not mean that foreign language teachers have given up all claim to the traditional specific values of language study. It means, rather, that they have accepted their share of the responsibility for the adjustment of traditional curricula and subject matter to the changing needs of their students.

Not so many years ago nearly all who were studying foreign languages in high school were definitely planning to pursue an academic or professional career. The mastery of at least one foreign language was considered a vital prerequisite for success in these fields. In recent years, however, an increasing majority of our students need a general orientation toward life and life's problems. The importance of every subject in the curriculum must now be measured largely by its contribution to the solution of the problem of social and individual adjustment, to the development of attitudes of cooperation and understanding, to the growth of ethical character and the ideals which instill dynamic citizenship.

Each of the modern world languages can be so taught as to attain these objectives in a unique manner. The language itself is the best possible key to the cultural achievements, ideals, and institutions of a nation. In every language class the alert teacher can find many ways to stimulate a more intelligent appreciation of our own institutions, enlarge the social vision and deepen the sense of responsibility of the students.

In the more advanced classes many devices and varied technique may be employed in the attainment of these general objectives. In the elementary courses the teachers often fail to take advantage of the beginner's interests. The expedient which offers the most immediate returns and opens the way for a wide variety of individual activity, is that of collateral reading in English about the foreign country, its culture, its history, and its people.

The Research Council Committee on Bibliography has studied several thousand books during the past two years, and lists of recommended books, arranged by topics, are included in the current report of the Research Council. The Council is prepared to suggest additional references or more elaborate library lists to any teacher or language depart-

ment. Attention should also be called to the article by Miss Dorothy M. Johns of University High School, Los Angeles, in the April number of the California Journal of Secondary Education in which Miss Johns summarizes the results she obtained in her French classes by encouraging this type of collateral study.

In order to find time for the pursuit of new objectives, it is necessary to reorganize the subject matter of each course. Nothing really worthwhile should be given up in the effort to emphasize the general aims of instruction. Last year the Research Council, therefore, decided to attack the problem of determining the minimum essentials in grammar and vocabulary for the first two years of high school and the first year of college and university foreign language courses.

More than 500 copies of the report of the Research Council were distributed to modern language teachers in Southern California and the responses have been most encouraging. Teachers in all types of schools using scores of different textbooks can now, for the first time, be assured that their work is in essential harmony. No attempt will be made to insist that any school adopt the Research Council's report without alteration, but it has already become a valuable basis for comparison and discussion in all parts of the Southland.

The next project undertaken by the Research Council was a statistical study of the texts in use in Southern California in elementary and intermediate foreign language courses. A survey of this information was presented in the several sections at the spring meeting of the Association. A brief summary of this project may be of general interest.

More than fifty schools reported French classes using 114 different texts. Of these texts, 29 were used in only one school; 34 in two; 9 in 3, and 4 in 4. Sixty-eight per cent of the texts reported are used in four schools or less. Only five texts are used in twenty or more schools: Eddy's *Beginning French* (24); Eddy's *Si Nous Lisions* (24); Carnahan, *French Review Grammar* (23); Méras, *Petits Contes de France* (20); and *Voyage de M. Périchon* (23). Only seven others are used in from twelve to nineteen of these schools reported: Daudet, *Neuf Contes Choisis* (16); *Language Literature and Life, Book I* (17); Loti, *Pêcheur de Islande* (14); Hugo, *Les Misérables* (16); Dondo, *Modern French* (12); Fraser and Squair, *Complete French Grammar* (12); *Pierille* (13).

In German, 24 schools reported 83 texts as follows: 43 are used in only one school; 76 texts or 90 per cent in four schools or less. Only two texts are used in ten schools and seven others in five or more.

In Spanish, 74 schools replied to the questionnaire reporting 169 different texts. Only three are used in twenty or more schools; Fried-

man, Arjona and Carvajal, *Spanish Grammar, Book I* (25); *Zaragüeta* (25); Pittaro and Green, *Beginners' Spanish* (23). Six others are used in from thirteen to nineteen schools; Torres, *Essentials of Spanish* (15); *José* (16); *Fortuna* (16); *Cuentos Contados* (15); *Marianela* (14); *El Capitán Veneno* (13).

A survey of the available collateral resources in school libraries proved disappointing. In French, fifteen schools reported that they have no collateral texts. Sixteen others have less than twenty-five, and only five had more than 100. Thirteen schools reported that they have no French books in the school library and fourteen others have less than 25, while ten have 100 or more. Ten schools have no books available in English about France. Sixteen have 25 or less, and only five have 100 or more.

Three out of 24 schools have neither German books nor books in English about Germany. Only six have 100 or more books in German and only three have 100 or more books in English about Germany.

In Spanish the same wide variation in equipment prevails, but the average number of books is somewhat greater than in French or German. The average of all available books in Spanish for collateral reading in English about Spain or Spanish peoples in junior high schools is 129, in high schools 139, in junior colleges 204, and in colleges 3058.

The research project which has been proposed by the Executive Council of the Association for the year 1936-1937, is the collection of definite data and records of experiments involving the application of our general objectives in actual classroom experience. In this enterprise the Research Council will seek to enlist the cooperation of as many teachers as possible. Every teacher is therefore urged to send in a detailed report for his or her school describing any project in which a foreign language department, class, or group makes a contribution. The Research Council plans to study all devices and methods of approach which may be used to advantage in adjusting our procedure to the requirements and ideals of modern education.

The success of this undertaking will depend almost entirely on the willingness of individual teachers to write detailed accounts of their observations and activities in group projects with other departments, collaboration in school programs, community enterprises, plays, class projects, contests, reports, collateral readings, personal hobbies, and the like. This study will undoubtedly prove a most interesting as well as a most important year's work and will merit the cooperation and support of every modern language teacher in Southern California.

F. H. REINSCH

*University of California at Los Angeles*

## POLITICAL REVIEWS

### FRANCE

The spring of 1936 has added dramatic chapters to European history. On March 7 Hitler precipitated a new crisis by sending German troops into the demilitarized zone of the Rhineland in a spectacular violation of the Treaty of Locarno. The signatory Powers protested without delay. They asked Germany not to go beyond a symbolistic demonstration and to permit a partial occupation of the Rhineland by British and Italian soldiers while a conference would study a permanent peace program. Hitler declined and made counter proposals. He affirmed that Germany had no intention of ever attacking France or Belgium. He offered a four months' truce during which he would not increase the Rhineland garrisons if France and Belgium made similar commitments. He was willing to negotiate a twenty-five-year non-aggression pact with France and Belgium. Discussion of economic problems would follow the political agreements.

It was an able diplomatic document which at first appealed to the friends of peace everywhere but could not appease the general resentment over flagrant and repeated treaty violations. Hitler had further undermined, without sufficient provocation, world confidence in international agreements. Consequently the European nations feel that a new formula of peace cannot be safely negotiated until Germany gives concrete evidence of good faith.

In spite of profound anxiety over this new conflict, there is no doubt that the prevailing sentiment in France is for peace. The real issue is how peace may be best preserved. The French Government, in reply to Hitler, submitted its own peace plan. Briefly its principal features were as follows:

There would be set up under the League Council a European commission which would regulate the revision of treaties, would have control over armaments and eventually would command an international force for mutual assistance. Each member of this association would promise to respect the present territorial status of the Continent for twenty-five years.

It must be granted that both proposals contain elements of real progress in European conciliation. Delicate though the undertaking may seem, it now becomes possible to work out a plan of cooperation. An opportunity is given Great Britain to formulate a constructive program of European settlement. In any case, the coming year is not likely to see a European war, but delicate and long drawn out negotiations. The chancelleries of Europe are facing a grave responsibility. Hitler will be wise to remember that, irrespective of treaties, the imponderables of the situation will be for a union of France and Great Britain against a German attack. England wishes to know whether it is equality or superiority that Hitler is so tenaciously seeking.

While hopefully waiting for diplomatic developments, the neighbors of the Reich cannot close their eyes to the realities of the situation. Germany is now in a position to hold the French at the Rhine. The troops are not numerous as yet and the zone is still without fortifications of any real military importance. Officially the soldiers stationed in the Rhineland are fixed at 36,000. But close behind the advance regiments stands the whole German army and the World War showed that a virtually impenetrable defensive trench system could be thrown up within a few days. It is evident that Germany is deter-



mined to fortify the zone sooner or later and never to surrender the right to do so. For practical purposes she is concerned only over the small but open section of frontier between Luxemburg and the Rhine. South of this the Rhine itself constitutes a most formidable fortification.

In any case, France and Germany appear to have checkmated each other along the Rhine. If conciliation fails, Germany can make plans for penetration of Central Europe or eastern expansion without so great a fear of France. When the fortification of the Rhineland has closed the gap through which French help might come, another coup may tempt the Nazis. Will it be in the direction of Austria, or Czechoslovakia, or Memel? Realists think that the German general staff will eagerly seize the first favorable opportunity. The hopes or forebodings of the Austrians would soon be confirmed were it not for the tireless vigilance of Mussolini.

The results of the French elections, awaited with no little anxiety in Europe, show a decided victory for the Left. The situation is not presently alarming. It is true that the combined front of Radical Socialists, Socialists and Communists will have a majority in the new Chamber which meets early next June. But it is easier to elect a majority than to hold it together. The average Frenchman likes to speak his own mind. He has definite social and political ideas and, with more or less discretion and wisdom, fights for them. If freedom of expression is a boon, the French electorate is especially fortunate. There seems to be a party for each shade of opinion: Communist, Socialist, Republican Socialist, Radical and Radical Socialist, Radical Left, Left Independent, Republican, Center Republican, and so on. The present victory is principally an eloquent protest against recent fascistic tendencies. Nevertheless it has immediately reacted upon the economic situation.

The fear that through a leftist victory the Bank of France might become a political football has disturbed French and international finance. The flow of capital out of France has been accelerated. The election has cost France over \$40,000,000 in gold lost to the United States alone. Large sums have also been given up to Great Britain.

The fate of the Bank of France is a cause of international perplexity. The radicals will renew the agitation for a plan to "reform" the Bank. Established in 1800 by Napoleon, the Bank has seen its statutes changed several times. Like other European central banks, it is privately owned, but operates under close governmental supervision. Of its board of fifteen regents, twelve are elected by the stockholders and three are appointed by the government. Of the stockholders only the 200 largest have the right to vote. To prevent any radical changes in its constitution, the Bank offers its own plan of "reform," namely to give every share of stock one vote and to add two or three Treasury officials to the board. A greater increase of the political element would cause world-wide uneasiness and distrust.

Léon Blum, acting to allay financial apprehension, assured the nation on May 9 that it had nothing to fear from the incoming of the Leftist government. "The People's Front government," he said, "will direct all its efforts to recreating prosperity and reviving sources of national activity. This would be impossible without large credit within the country. Thus, by exercising violence and provoking trouble and tumult, we would be going against our object."

The program of the Communist party itself, now controlling seventy seats, is strikingly similar to the "New Deal": important public works, higher wages, a forty-hour week, promotion of child welfare, public assistance for the underprivileged, revaluation of agricultural produce, and if it becomes necessary, a levy on capital. To American Democrats of 1936 these measures will not appear particularly revolutionary.

Italian Fascism has clearly demonstrated its determination and prowess and proved the superiority of modern weapons over poorly equipped and undisciplined natives. The military phase of the Ethiopian drama is over. The diplomatic and economic phases are only beginning. The war, which was intended to remain a colonial matter, has changed the whole international status. The conflict has grown to such proportions that Anglo-Italian friendship has been disrupted, Anglo-French unity has been impaired, the prestige of the League of Nations has been seriously damaged, and Hitler enabled to proceed with the further realization of his dreams of expansion. A nationalistic victory has been won over Geneva and collective security.

But that victory may not be as final and complete as it seems. The Left leaders of France may demand a reorientation of French policy, and cooperate more heartily with Great Britain. Moreover, recent political developments in France, Spain, Greece, Switzerland, Poland, Jugoslavia, show that democracy is willing to meet the challenge of dictatorships. Few dare predict the outcome of the struggle, but democracy is more firmly entrenched in Europe than most people suspect.

On May 6 the United States and France entered reciprocal trade agreements culminating thirteen months of secret negotiations. The treaty was signed by Secretary of State Cordell Hull and French Ambassador André de La Bouley. It is the first comprehensive pact governing Franco-American trade relations since the commercial treaty of 1857. France ranks fifth among buyers of American goods. In the six-year period, 1929-1934, American exports to France fell from 266 million dollars to 115 millions. In the same interval French exports to the United States shrank from 171 millions to 57 millions. Leading American exports have been unfinished cotton, petroleum products, refined copper, kerosene and leaf tobacco. Principal French imports have been silk and silk garments, gloves, furs, precious stones, and works of art. A resumption of international trade is the best foundation of prosperity and a help to increasing political understanding and cooperation.

PAUL PÉRIGORD

*University of California at Los Angeles*

## GERMANY

Referring to the relations between the Free City and the League of Nations, Herr Greiser, President of the Danzig Senate, in a statement before the League Council on January 22 asserted that the difficulties arose from a divergence of opinion between the jurists appointed by the League and those representing the Free City.

A trade agreement signed with Denmark on January 22 provided for the purchase by the latter country of German industrial products in exchange for increased sales of agricultural products. From the report of the Foreign Bank Creditors' Committee on February 20, which recommended an extension of the credit agreement for another year, without changing the rate of interest, it was seen that the German import surplus of 284 million marks in 1934 had been converted into an export surplus of 111 millions in 1935. This, however, meant an actual increase in exports only to the extent of one quarter of the figure, since the other three-quarters were due to a reduction in imports.

In a speech at the opening of the Leipzig Fair on the first of March, Dr. Goebbels spoke of "the systematic destruction of Germany's economic powers" resulting from the Treaty of Versailles, and its unfortunate effect on world trade. He pointed to the unequal distribution among the nations of the world of such raw materials, fundamental for modern industry, as coal, iron, oil, cotton and rubber.

On the fourth of March it was announced that Herr Kerl, head of the State Committee, had appointed Dr. Marahrens, the Bishop of Hanover, to administer the Evangelical Church in Hanover. Later in the month the Confessional Movement in the Protestant Church appointed a new Provisional Administration to take the place of that presided over by Dr. Marahrens, which had resigned during the synod last February. On March 21 a new German Lutheran Church was formed by the union of the Evangelical Churches of Bavaria, Hanover, Mecklenburg, Saxony and Württemberg. The spiritual leadership of the Church was to be exercised by the Bishops, sitting in common council.

A German memorandum denouncing the Treaty of Locarno and offering to negotiate new agreements with France and Belgium for the establishment of a bilateral demilitarized zone, was sent to the Governments of France, Belgium, Italy and Great Britain on March 7. In the German view the Franco-Soviet Pact was directed exclusively against Germany. The obligations to which France committed herself with respect to the U. S. S. R. meant in practice that, under certain conditions, France would act as though neither the League Covenant nor the Locarno Treaty, which referred to that Covenant, were still valid.

In this memorandum the German Government also proposed a non-aggression pact between Germany, France and Belgium for the duration of 25 years, England and Italy being invited to sign it as guarantor Powers. In conclusion it was stated that "with the achievement . . . of Germany's equality of rights and the restoration of full sovereignty over the whole territory of the Reich, the German Government regard the chief reason for their withdrawal from the League as eliminated. Germany is therefore prepared to enter the League again. In so saying, she expresses at the same time her expectation that, in the course of a reasonable space of time, the problem of colonial equality of

rights as well as of the separation of the League Covenant from the Versailles Treaty base will be clarified in the course of friendly negotiations."

The total number of German troops, that marched into Cologne, Düsseldorf, Mainz and other Rhineland towns on the seventh of March was estimated at 40,000 or more.

In the election held on March 29 the percentage of votes for the Nazi Party and the participation in the poll were both about 99 per cent. It would appear that casting an adverse vote was equivalent to nullifying it.

The "White Paper" published on the 20th of March, containing the proposals of the Locarno Powers requested Germany to submit her case against the Soviet Pact to the Hague Court and to agree to accept its decision; it was also urged that, pending further negotiations, her regular troops or other forces in the Rhineland should not be increased nor fortifications built.

In a speech at Frankfurt Dr. Goebbels deprecated the suggestion by the Locarno Powers of a twenty kilometre zone, where international troops were to be stationed, saying that it was too reminiscent of the year 1919 and incompatible with German honor.

The German reply to the Locarno Powers' London proposals reached Mr. Eden on Wednesday, the first of April. Its chief points were the following: the non-aggression pact with France and Belgium on the same terms as suggested in the previous memorandum; a four months' truce for negotiations, with a pledge not to increase the Rhineland garrisons, providing for similar pledges on the part of France and Belgium; regional pacts of assistance among nations; equal rights to colonies; reentry of Germany into the League. Germany also suggested the setting up of a new International Court of Arbitration at Geneva, to which questions relating to the agreements should be submitted. It was proposed that Germany and France make a voluntary agreement to avoid everything in the education of youth and in all publications, which might poison the relations of the two nations.

According to a report from Berlin of the 27th of April, approximately 50,000 Reich prisoners will be freed by Herr Hitler's birthday amnesties. Among these are chiefly National Socialists serving sentences not exceeding six months, individuals arrested for being political malcontents and pastors, who violated the "pulpit paragraph" by attacking the state in their sermons.

The first of May was "Joy Day" by decree in Germany. The Reichsführer took the occasion of his May Day speech to German workers to repudiate the assertions made in other countries that Germany intended marching against any neighbor state.

On May second Germany made a commercial treaty with Manchoukuo. It is the result of Dr. Otto Kieper's economic mission in the Orient and will mean chiefly that the soy bean, Manchoukuo's best known agricultural product, will be exchanged for industrial products from Germany.

General Göring, now Germany's supreme dictator of foreign exchange and raw materials, on May 4 designated his cousin, Herbert Göring, as Director of the Economics Ministry. The latter can be depended upon to represent most vigorously the policies of Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, the Minister of Economics and President of the Reichsbank.

GERALD M. SPRING

*University of California at Los Angeles*

## SPAIN

Early in January the *Cortes* were dissolved by order of President Alcalá Zamora. The elections of representatives to the new *Cortes* were held in February. The returns showed clearly that Spain had swung violently to the political Left after two years of seemingly ineffectual government by the Conservative and Center parties. The number of deputies elected in the different groups was: Leftists, 266; Rightists, 142; Center parties, 65.

The leftist victory (with 87 Socialists and 81 Left Republicans) was made possible by the cooperation and support of the extremists and radical elements of the nation, headed by Sr. Largo Caballero, whose aim is a truly Socialistic Republic. It meant a complete about face in the future policies of the Republic, after two years of rule by the Conservatives and Centrists. As soon as the results of the elections were known, the ministry in power, under the premiership of Sr. Portela Valladares (Center), resigned in complete panic. Sr. Azaña, the most able man and the leader of the Leftist Republican party, was entrusted with the formation of a new government more in accord with the popular wish. The radical elements of the nation, however, drunk with victory, took advantage of the sudden change of government to boast publicly and noisily of their newly demonstrated power with acts of terrorism and burning of churches. A "state of alarm" was declared by the government of Sr. Azaña, who now was confronted with the task of checking the excesses of some of the extremists who had helped in bringing him into power.

An amnesty for the thousands of political prisoners that filled the Spanish jails since October 1934 was proclaimed, according to campaign promises.

When the members of the new *Cortes* were sworn and duly constituted, their first task was to pass judgment upon whether President Alcalá Zamora had acted with cause when he dissolved the previous *Cortes*. It must be explained that the Constitution of the Republic gives authority to the President to dissolve the *Cortes* only twice, with the provision that the following *Cortes* may decide whether there was justification in the second dissolution. In the case of a majority voting in the negative, the President is to be deposed *ipso facto* and ousted from the Presidency. When Sr. Indalecio Prieto, representing the Popular Front (Extreme Left parties) presented the motion that President Zamora dissolved the former *Cortes* without cause, and therefore illegally (the first *Cortes* had also been dissolved), the impending complications brought on a solemnity and an emotional tenseness seldom experienced in the debates of the Chamber. The paradoxical point, of which everyone present was secretly aware, was the fact that the former Parliament was dissolved at the insistent demands of the parties of the Left. They claimed then that the popular will was no longer represented by a Parliament elected two years before. The nation had changed greatly. A reaction against conservative rule was evident. (The newly elected *Cortes*, with its majority of representatives from the Left parties confirms the truth of these claims.) But these were not the real reasons for wishing to oust the President. They were plainly stated in political circles and in newspaper editorials: President Zamora was a devout Catholic and at heart a Conservative with tendencies toward the Center; he entrusted the government to leaders with no following to speak of, to members of the discredited Center parties; he tried to build a party of his own by means of

his friends, whom he kept in power without justification from the point of view of the electorate.

None of these reasons were mentioned by Sr. Prieto in his attack against the President. The opposition of some members of the Right and Center was ineffective. Sr. Azaña and members of the government remained silent. On April 7, 11:15 P.M.—after five hours of debate—the motion, declaring illegal the act of dissolution of the former *Cortes*, was approved by a vote of 238 against 5. Sr. Zamora ceased to be President. A committee of representatives proceeded to his home to give him official notification. They were told that the President had retired and could not be disturbed. They went then to the Presidential Palace and notified his secretary. When the committee reported back to the *Cortes* it was shortly past midnight. Then, Sr. Martinez Barrio, President of the *Cortes* became temporary President of the Republic—according to the Constitution—until the new President is elected by the members of the *Cortes* and by an equal number of special electors to be chosen at the polls within thirty days. The selection of the special electors of the President was made in the last part of April.

At the time of this writing (May 11) the press dispatches announce that the newly elected President of the Spanish Republic is Sr. Azaña, former Premier.

H. CORBATÓ

*University of California at Los Angeles*



## REVIEWS

*Flowers of Evil.* By Charles Baudelaire. Translated from the French by George Dillon and Edna St. Vincent Millay. With the original texts and an introduction by Miss Millay. (New York and London, Harpers, 2nd ed., 1936.)

In this volume the translators essay to bring to English-speaking readers some of the best of Baudelaire's poetry. They give versions of 67 of the 151 poems included in the Calmann-Lévy edition of *Les Fleurs du Mal* and add five others not contained in that collection. Of these 72 translations Miss Millay contributes 37 and Mr. Dillon the remainder. In the lengthy preface Miss Millay discusses the problem of translating poetry, especially French verse. Her remarks are keenly appreciative and give the reader a very real sense of the difficulties; and they are discussed as a poet would discuss.

To render the verse of one language into that of another, even when the languages have a fundamental relationship as do German and English, is at best a serious undertaking. But, when we have such a contrast of verse theory as is afforded by English and French, the effort is doubly difficult. Finally, when a French poet represents such an intricate and subtle art as does Baudelaire, the task seems wellnigh impossible. English verse is essentially accentual and depends largely upon a definite succession of rhythmic beats; rhyme is not required. French verse is wholly syllabic, the rhythm is wholly different from that of English; rhyme is essential. In fact, blank verse cannot be composed in French with any great degree of success. Moreover, a French poet, particularly if he be a romanticist or a parnassian, is intensely *artiste*. The connection with music is closely preserved; words are chosen for the effect of the vowels and consonants that they contain as well as for their meaning; the rhymes are selected with the same ends in view. Some English poets hold to the same idea,—witness Shelley's description of the moon in *The Cloud*—but as a rule this phase of verse-technique is far less considered in English than in French.

Certain French poets,—Paul Valéry and Lucie Delarue-Mardrus—accord great praise to our two translators. Miss Millay and Mr. Dillon give the reader, who is ignorant of French or whose command of the language is too slight to attempt Baudelaire, an excellent opportunity to know and enjoy the poet. Nevertheless, we suspect that the translations must fail to satisfy entirely anyone who is familiar with the originals. Too often we lose Baudelaire and are faced by an alien spirit; too often the intricate music of the source has disappeared. To choose one case that will serve for many cases. In the first line of *The Albatross* one cannot feel that "Sometimes, to entertain themselves, the men of the crew" is a satisfying rendition of "Souvent, pour s'amuser, les hommes d'équipage." Nor is there anything in the same strophe to suggest the effect of "Le navire glissant sur les gouffres amers," where "navire" and "glissant" evoke the sound-image of a vessel cleaving a tranquil sea. And in the last strophe, "The Poet is like that wild inheritor of the cloud" is somewhat feeble in comparison with "Le Poète est semblable au prince des nuées."

It would, of course, require a far more detailed analysis of any individual poem to make the criticism entirely clear,—far more detailed a criticism than we have space to give. On the other hand, Miss Millay's version of *Les*

*Litanies de Satan* is exceedingly well done. It may be ungracious to voice it, but our feeling is that Miss Millay's part of the work is more successful than that of Mr. Dillon.

It is just to state that the translators have shown good judgment in their choice. However, it is hard to understand the omission of some poems. When we remember that Baudelaire was so definitely a worshipper of beauty and a devotee of the doctrine of "L'Art pour l'Art," why forget the two fine compositions, *La Beauté* and *Hymne à la Beauté*? If Miss Millay is not embarrassed in translating *Une Martyre*, why does she not include *Sed non Satiata* and *Une Charogne* which are assuredly no more frank or repulsive and which have so distinct a significance in Baudelaire's life? Above all, why leave out *Une Confession*, those beautiful lines that were composed for Madame Sabatier when the spiritual for the moment had the ascendancy over the sensual?

But let us not be too captious or hypercritical. The collaborators have made Baudelaire accessible to thousands who would not otherwise know him. They provide an acquaintance with a unique and enigmatic poet whose influence was,—and is—tremendous upon modern French poetry. They have labored faithfully and intelligently. If their effort does not give the entire Baudelaire, it is mainly because the jealous spirit of the French language will not permit the exportation of a masterpiece of poetic art any more than the nation itself would permit the exportation of one of the treasures of the Louvre.

H. R. BRUSH

*University of California at Los Angeles*

*Spanish Adventure.* By Norman Lewis. (New York, Henry Holt and Co., 1935. vi + 289 pp. \$3.00.)

One good day in September, 1934, Mr. Lewis, British, 26, keen of eye and keen of pen, well-shaven, in sweater and shorts, and carrying along a trailer, a suitcase heavy with photographic equipment, haversacks and his pal, Eugene, left England all keyed up for the fantastic enterprise of navigating by canoe from Normandy to Portugal. The Portuguese finale was probably suggested by reminiscences of Wellington bivouacking on the banks of the Douro. Mr. Lewis' charming ignorance of fluvial matters and of the topographical and ethnic factors, was due to having nourished his plastic mind with inciting tourist folders. Or perhaps he was one of those authentic heroes like Don Quixote who go to the attack of things that happen on the road without inquiring into the nature of the thing or the strength of their weapons.

Be it as it may, his ignorance—even in a man of undoubted schooling—is nothing to astonish the reviewer, for he has known an American consular officer who transported a canoe all the way from a middlewestern town to the heart of Spain, only to find upon arrival that Madrid was the one sizable city in the world without a respectable body of water. "Old Madrid," of course, has a river, but everybody knows that in true Latin behavior in its lazy spells it refuses to get wet. The irrepressible American told me the story chuckling, as one of the funniest occurrences that had enlivened his existence since his ill-absorbed geographic lessons in high school. Mr. Lewis does likewise. He laughs heartily at his own joke and makes the reader happy with the recital of his tribulations trying to navigate the river Sarthe from Alençon.

"Incredulous stares" did not deter this modern Tartarin. If he had to abandon the trip it was because his course was "slightly" obstructed by phalanxes of flags and other obscene vegetation, rows of mills, and finally by sheer lack of water. Starvation also played its part in the anti-climax for they had started without provisions aspiring to subsist on fish caught during the day's journey. Undismayed, they decided to grow a beard, dismantle the canoe and make for Spain—by train!

The Spanish adventure occupies the center of the book, with a few chapters at the end sketching a hurried trip to Portugal and Morocco. It was the good luck of these adventurers to walk into the bloody proletarian revolution of October 1934. They arrived in Madrid at the precise moment that the railway station was being attacked by the populace. They saw actual fighting on the streets and narrowly escaped being immolated to the gods of travelling literature, if such a low genre is represented in Parnassus. Mr. Lewis gives a lively eye-witness account of the four days that gripped the nation.

A spirit of refreshing juvenile zest pervades the book. Mr. Lewis displays imperial British qualities: imperviousness to ridicule, a Livingstonian endurance for exploration, and a morbid enjoyment of ambiguous situations. Instead of the travel yarn of sedate reverends who go to Spain to record her cruelty and religious bigotry, or dullish professors who perambulate the ancient cities to galvanize the skeletons of history, or the "interpretative minds" who set their jaws to unveil the mysterious, semi-savage land, Mr. Lewis has manufactured with verbal power and nonchalance a narrative of picaresque trimmings sparkling with comedy and direct observation.

Monuments do not attract him. He is past this sacred topic. He focuses his eye and his camera on the landscape, of "such terrestrial purity one is demoted to the status of a stain"; on gay girls and gypsies who live and sing "deep"; on the ex-men of the sewers, on the proletariat, whom he loves, cautiously; on the nondescript inmates of the third-rate hotels he patronizes; on the "paseos" where the youth of the town wink their eyes; on the third-class train companions who make the going uncomfortable but who offer him of their food and of their opinions—on all that which constitutes the internal, every-day life. These scenes and types he describes with bold strokes, with a mastery for quick portraiture that augurs a literary as well as a photographic future, for the book is illustrated with superb pictures of his own making.

The result of his talents and attitude is a chronicle of homely events, rich in humanity, but uneven in merit. One experiences the pains of *diminuendo*, a grave sin in literary workmanship. The first half of the composition is brilliant; the second grows vacuous in several spots. A legitimate writer like Mr. Lewis does not need to strive so hard for verbal effects. Amidst first-rate prose, one feels at times the uneasiness of watching a literary adolescent in his first wooings of diction. Another fault—this a venial one from the literary point of view, since the author clearly aims at broad comedy—is not to hesitate to exploit a minor point to produce hilarity, even if truth suffers in the process. The great Spanish humorist Julio Camba does the same. With all, Mr. Lewis' performance is worthy of a genuine praise which I do not wish to jeopardize with too many objections.

JOAQUÍN ORTEGA

*University of Wisconsin*

## TEXT BOOKS

### FRENCH

*A Dictionary of French Slang.* By Oliver Leroy. (Henry Holt and Company, 1936. 237 pp. \$2.50.)

Here is a book that had been needed for a long time, a dictionary of slang with English equivalents, a book which will help the student in many of his readings. It is true that, with the vulgarization of arts, slang and bad taste have invaded the different forms of literature, especially its most democratic: the novel. But if the natives should be encouraged to use the standard or accepted language, so should for a stronger reason the foreign student of French, as slang has always a ring of artificiality or pedantry on the lips of those who do not live in the sphere where it is spoken.

The fact that colloquialisms and popular expressions are of such currency that they finally become adopted by members of the Institut or the French Academy, as is pointed out in the Preface, should not convey the impression that slang, especially a certain kind of slang, is used in all strata of French society. The author himself seems to recognize the distinction later when he warns that the word "should be taken in its widest meaning to include much that a philologist would hardly call slang at all . . ."

The dictionary is well presented and we have found only two typographical errors: "*C'est moi arrose*," for *C'est moi qui arrose* (p. 15); and "*cagneuse*," for *gagneuse* (p. 124). But it may offer some difficulty to Americans insufficiently acquainted with English slang, and it lacks a certain number of expressions often heard or read today such as: *agro, caso, cube, hosto* (for prison), *rupiner, buquer, chercher la petite bête, chercher midi à quatorze heures, ce n'est pas une colique, boire un canon, de fil en aiguille, être dur à cuire, coucher sur la dure, un coup de Jarnac, se poser là, être gris, il n'y a rien à frire, s'en ficher comme de l'an quarante, faire grise mine, mettre les petits plats dans les grands, les agis d'une maison*, etc.

Of course the book does not boast of completeness, and as a manual, it will be found useful if not indispensable by those interested in naturalistic literature, popular or vulgar speech.

MARIUS I. BIENCOURT

*University of California at Los Angeles*

*Quatre Contes Choisis.* By Alphonse Daudet. Edited by Frank Warren Roberts. (D. C. Heath and Company, 1936. ix + 68 pp. text and exercises + 8 pp. irregular verbs + 30 pp. vocabulary. \$.76.)

In choosing four little stories representative of the genius of that master of short-story telling, Daudet, the editor has made a happy selection. From the *Contes du lundi*, he has taken *La Dernière Classe* and *Le Siège de Berlin*, and from *Les Lettres de Mon Moulin*, *La Chèvre de M. Seguin* and *Le Secret de Maître Cornille*. These may be enjoyed by young students with two years preparation in French, notwithstanding the assertion by some university professors that literature should not be studied in high schools or even in junior colleges. The editor assumes that the book will be used for the latter part of the second year or the first part of the third year of high school. He is to

be commended for not having changed the stories, thereby preserving the charm of Daudet's style and showing the author at his best.

The numerous exercises based on the text are varied and interesting, and at the same time offer sufficient drill in grammar and vocabulary to replace more formal composition. Questionnaires, graded in difficulty, test the student's comprehension. Placing these exercises at the middle and end of each story and providing copious footnotes on each page seems an improvement over many older texts which necessitate one's constant turning to the back of the book.

Directions to the student are for the most part in French although comments and questions to arouse his interest at the beginning of the stories are in English. A seeming inconsistency in the use of English in the footnotes to explain some expressions while French is used for others may be due to a desire on the part of the editor to use English where the French equivalent would entail further vocabulary thumbing on the part of the student.

A noteworthy feature of the present edition is, to quote the editor, that "one exercise on each story contains a *project* calling for individual investigation, and offering the student an opportunity to associate his study in French with that in other departments,—English, history, and art." This merging of the student's work in French with his other interests is in line with the cultural objectives set up, not only by progressive language teachers of the present, but by all thoughtful, wide-awake teachers of the past.

LUCY M. GIDNEY

Los Angeles Junior College

*Les Oberlié.* By René Bazin. Adapted and edited by J. Douglas Haygood. (D. C. Heath and Company, 1936, vii + 136 pp. text + 4 pp. idiom list + 20 pp. vocabulary. \$1.00.)

René Bazin's *Les Oberlié*, the story of the Alsatian family whose division of feeling in regard to the German rule following the Franco-Prussian war brought unhappiness and tragedy to its members, has been adapted and edited by J. Douglas Haygood to form a graded reader designed for extensive reading after *Si Nous Lisions* and *Pierrille* in the Heath-Chicago French series. Assuming a knowledge of the first 1500 words of the Vander Beke *French Word Book* only 522 new words and idioms occur in the text of 30,787 running words (the figures are taken from the preface). This is a very low density which should insure ease of reading on the part of the student. Furthermore, vocabularies at the beginning of each chapter containing all words not previously used in the series and asterisks placed after these words as they occur in the text facilitate the mechanics of translation.

This ease of reading and the resulting enjoyment on the part of the elementary student justify the simplifications of the text. This has been skillfully done for the story is still complete and the emotional qualities are only slightly impaired. Without knowing the original well it would be impossible to tell where the cuts occur and the simplified language of the reader is still good French. In short Professor Haygood has done a laudable piece of work.

The question may be raised, however, as to whether *Les Oberlié* is a wise choice for classroom use even as an extensive reader. It has manifest qualities—sincere love of country, so fervent that it is an emotion, and human sympathy

that moves through its genuineness. However, it suffers artistically from being a *roman à thèse*. Bazin working from an abstract idea creates a situation and plot too geometrically perfect to be altogether realistic. One also feels that wishing to strengthen his story by making it end tragically, he has forced the tragedy somewhat illogically with a regrettable melodramatic climax. But an even stronger objection than these artistic ones can be raised by the theme of the work. Its nationalistic fervor is too one-sided not to arouse objections on the part of the average American student. To spend the few weeks needed to cover it as an extensive reader or the longer period if it were studied intensively seems of dubious wisdom. However, Professor Haygood's edition of *Les Oberlé* would be an excellent choice for outside reading by some students and should be a worthwhile addition to school libraries where easy books of worthwhile content are all too few.

STELLA LOVERING

Los Angeles Junior College

#### GERMAN

*Essentials of German.* By B. J. Vos. (Henry Holt and Company, sixth (revised) edition, 1936. vi + 369 + lvi pp. \$1.60.)

This book is more than merely a new edition of the well-known and well-tried *Essentials of German*; it has been carefully revised and altered. The exercises calling for translation from English into German have been reduced to an extent that is in keeping with modern pedagogical views. The grammatical sections have been made simpler, clearer, more direct, and more inductive. Six songs with their musical accompaniment have been added to the Appendix, and the number of lessons has been increased by three, rendering possible a greater unity of subject matter for several chapters. As a result, the distribution of material in this book has become well nigh ideal and contrasts most favorably with that found in other works of its kind. Each lesson deals with only one major topic.

On every page one feels that this book has grown out of the classroom experience of the author. This is evidenced by such things as the illustration of the use of *jetzt*, *noch*, and *schon* (p. 71), of *vor: bevor* and *nach: nachdem* (p. 231), and the proper emphasis that certain confusing intricacies of grammar have received.

Only in very few instances might further changes have slightly enhanced the value of *Essentials of German*. Although the reading material has been modernized to a certain extent, some has been retained that, to be sure, serves its purpose but with regard to contents does not quite equal the other excellent features and innovations of the book. Yet practically all texts are suitable for conversation exercises and other forms of oral drill.

In this edition, as in the preceding ones, the texts do not stand at the beginning, but rather at the end of the lesson. They follow even the large bulk of exercises and seem to be considered more a goal than a starting point. Obviously the author is opposed to the often over-done attempt of teachers to plunge the student *medias in res* without first carefully "breaking the ground."

The correspondence existing between the consonants of German-English



cognates might have been illustrated with greater profit at the beginning of the book where the relation between the two languages is suggested than where it actually appears, namely in the final survey (p. 331).

Minor defects are the complete lack of illustrations, the substitution of *drin* (used in the spoken language) for the literary form *darin* (pp. 63, 64), the statement that Germany borders on Czecho-Slovakia in the *East* (p. 71), and—in spite of a reference to a more accurate wording of the rule governing the declension of adjectives—the statement that the strong endings are used, if the adjective “is not preceded by a *der-* or *ein-*word” (p. 139).

*Deutsche Stunden.* By L. M. Schmidt and E. Glokke. (D. C. Heath and Company, 1936. xxv + 402 pp. \$1.60.)

The subtitle of this introduction to German is *Lehrbuch nach der direkten Methode*. It is planned for use in the average high school course, but the authors believe it to be adequate and interesting enough also for college work. Everyone who has perused the book will agree that the last three parts dealing with Germany and her people, with history and legends, and with young people hiking through Southern Germany are well suited also for the more mature student. In general, the texts furnish an adequate basis for conversation exercises, impart information about German culture, sufficiently illustrate the grammatical topics of a lesson and are wholly satisfactory from the stylistic point of view.

The primary aim of the book is to develop in the pupil the ability to read German with some fluency. Subservient to this end are the secondary objects of using the language in simple speech and writing.

Accordingly, vocabulary has been stressed more than grammar. This explains the few instances where the presentation of grammatical rules slightly lacks in accuracy and completeness, such as is the case with the distinction between *als* and *wenn* (p. 268) and the explanation of the position of *nicht* (p. 271). *Gehen* and *stehen* are mentioned as the only strong verbs where the long *e* does not change (p. 282). The plural formation of nouns is mentioned among the elements of minor importance (p. IV). Yet these slight deficiencies are more than offset by the remarkable simplicity and clarity with which the grammar is presented.

The exercise material is ample and varied, consisting of the question and answer type, completion, mutation, and translation.

On the whole, *Deutsche Stunden* is one of the most usable and attractive books of its kind on the market. It abounds in excellent picture material. No doubt, students and teachers alike will greatly enjoy working with it.

GODFREY EHRLICH

University of California at Los Angeles

*Et cetera*, a monthly periodical published by the German Publishing and Printing Company, Incorporated, 193 River Street, Troy, New York, Volume I, No. 1, March, 1936; Volume I, No. 2, April, 1936; 48 pages per issue. Single copies 25 cents; yearly \$2.50 in the U.S.A., elsewhere \$3.00.

The integrating tendency in modern education is perhaps responsible for the appearance of this new type of reading matter for students of German. Students who have tried to read German periodical literature in their various fields of interest have usually become discouraged because such reading is almost invariably too difficult for them. Those who occasionally browse through a German newspaper, *The Echo*, or similar publications, find them too desultory to reward any persistent interest.

*Et cetera* will appeal particularly to students of German beyond the first year. It is a readers' digest in German of a wide range of German periodicals including *Volk und Welt*, *Westermanns Monatshefte*, *Neues Musikblatt*, *Der deutsche Sportflieger*, *Technik für Alle*, *Kosmos*, *Deutsche Rundschau*, and many others. Excerpts from timely books are also included.

The material is carefully edited in order to obviate the major difficulties which students might have in reading original articles. The interest of the student may thus be aroused by the reading of a digest summary or excerpt, and he may then wish to become acquainted with the original publications. *Et cetera* thus provides an inexpensive and convenient means whereby students of German may become familiar with the contributions which Germany is making to modern life in the fields of literature, the arts, and the natural and social sciences.

F. H. REINSCH

*University of California at Los Angeles*

## SPANISH

*Elements of Spanish.* By Sturgis E. Leavitt and Sterling A. Stoudemire. (Henry Holt and Company, 1935. xi + 133 + xxviii pp. \$1.16.)

This simplified grammar will meet with the approval of many teachers who do not want to burden and confuse beginning students of Spanish with a maze of rules and exceptions. The aim of the authors was to present a simple, clear statement of the fundamental elements of Spanish. They have succeeded fully. Grammar has been reduced to its minimum essentials and the result is a very lucid introductory text, designed for a foundation course for high schools and colleges.

An important feature of this work is that the rules of pronunciation have been incorporated in the first five lessons, instead of in an introduction. Thus the acquiring of a good pronunciation at the beginning is made practical and interesting.

There are thirty lessons in all, each divided into vocabulary, rules and exercises (comprehension, translation, composition). Grammatical forms and verb paradigms appear in frames throughout the different lessons; this will appeal to many students with the so-called photographic memory. The vocabulary is of a most practical and simple nature, since the greater part of it has been chosen from the 700 words of Buchanan's list, although others of

less frequency but of obvious necessity for the elementary student have also been included.

This type of clear, simplified grammar comes to fill a real need.

*Antología de Ensayos Españoles.* Notes and Vocabulary by Antonio Alonso. (D. C. Heath and Company, 1936. xxi + 325 pp. \$1.20.)

This is a compilation of representative essays, selected from the works of the most distinguished contemporary writers. A book of this kind will prove invaluable in the classroom, not only because of its usefulness in advanced classes as a text for the study of the language, but also because the acquaintance of the contemporary Spanish essayists and the study of their writings will serve as an excellent introduction to the study of Spanish literature and history.

There are ten authors represented in this Anthology: Gómez de Baquero, Ganivet, Unamuno, Ortega y Gasset, Azorín, D'Ors, Pérez de Ayala, Grandmontagne, Maeztu, Araquistáin and Madariaga. The essays chosen deal with Spanish history, culture, art, and literature. They cannot fail to arouse a permanent interest in the literature and the arts of Spain, besides offering an adequate background for the comprehension of Spanish life and thought.

The notes provided by the editor are of two kinds, grammatical and literary. The latter will guide the student safely through a continuous mass of literary, historical and geographical allusions. The book is enriched with an excellent *Introducción* by Sr. Federico de Onís, of Columbia University, in which he interprets the literary values of the Spanish essay and traces its backgrounds and history. A valuable bibliography for each of the authors represented is also appended.

H. CORBATÓ

*University of California at Los Angeles*

## MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

SUPPLEMENTARY LIST OF MEMBERS WHOSE MEMBERSHIP HAS BEEN RENEWED FOR THE PRESENT YEAR WHICH BEGAN ON OCTOBER 1, 1935<sup>1</sup>

SECTION PREFERENCE—FRENCH, GERMAN, ITALIAN, SPANISH—IS INDICATED AFTER EACH NAME BY THE INITIAL LETTER OF THE LANGUAGE

SUSTAINING MEMBERSHIP IS INDICATED BY \*

Adam, Esther C. LeConte Junior High S., Los Angeles (F.)  
Brand, Bernice. Fallbrook Union High S., Fallbrook (S.)  
Cain, Gertrude. Hoover High S., Glendale (S.)  
Clark, Lola B. Covina High S., Covina (S.)  
Corbató, Hermenegildo. Univ. of Cal. at L. A., W. Los Angeles (S.)  
Cordon, Ramona. King Junior High S., Los Angeles (S.)  
Drummond, Wesley. Long Beach Junior Coll., Long Beach (S.)  
Ehrlich, Godfrey. Univ. of Cal. at L. A., West Los Angeles (G.)  
Everett, Percy. Orange Union High S., Orange (S.)  
Gilson, Dorothy. Glendale High S., Glendale (F.)  
González, Manuel P. Univ. of Cal. at L. A., West Los Angeles (G.)  
Heslet, Frank. Stevenson Junior High S., Los Angeles (S.)  
\*Hoffmann, Rolf. Univ. of Cal. at L. A., West Los Angeles (G.)  
Hyatt, Hazel. Corona High S., Corona (F.)  
Indovina, Josephine. Los Angeles Junior Coll., Los Angeles (I.)  
Lovering, Stella. Los Angeles Junior Coll., Los Angeles (F.)  
Manetta, Laura. Glendale High S., Glendale (F.)  
Maxwell, Jane. Central Junior High S., Los Angeles (S.)  
Melick, Marguerite. South Gate High S., South Gate (S.)  
Pedroarena, Ysidora. Los Angeles High S., Los Angeles (S.)  
Porter, Minette. Oceanside-Carlsbad Union High S., Oceanside (F.)  
Purdum, Margaret. Citrus Union High S., Azusa (S.)  
Quinn, Corinthe. Univ. of Cal. at L. A., West Los Angeles (S.)  
Scheele, Norbert. Los Angeles Junior Coll., Los Angeles (G.)  
Schomaker, Christel. Univ. of Cal. at L. A., West Los Angeles (G.)  
Sosso, Pietro. El Var Hotel, Los Angeles (S.)  
Swart, Esther. Banning High S., Wilmington (S.)  
Templin, Ernest H. Univ. of Cal. at L. A., West Los Angeles (S.)  
Turner, Dorcas. Fullerton High S., Fullerton (S.)  
Vertrees, May. Huntington Park High S., Huntington Park (S.)  
Volkers, Charlotte. Roosevelt High S., Los Angeles (S.)  
Weldon, Evelyn. LaFayette Junior High S., Los Angeles (S.)  
Wilkinson, Ruth. Burbank High S., Burbank (F.)  
Yankwich, Léon R. Judge of the U. S. Dist. Court, Los Angeles (F.)

<sup>1</sup>This is a continuation of the Membership List that was begun in the February, 1936, issue of the *Modern Language Forum*.